



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



A

3 9015 00393 236 8

University of Michigan - BUHR

CHAUTAUQUA
LITERARY AND SCIENTIFIC
CIRCLE



IMPERIAL GERMANY
SIDNEY WHITMAN



CENTRAL EUROPE

1815

Showing the
German Confederation
of the
Peace of Vienna



D
1
W
10



From a photograph by E. Bieber, Berlin, reproduced by permission

Imperial Germany

A CRITICAL STUDY OF
FACT AND CHARACTER

BY

SIDNEY WHITMAN, F. R. G. S.

*Author of "The Realm of the Hapsburgs," "Teuton Studies," "The
Story of Austria," etc.*



NEW YORK CLEVELAND CHICAGO

Chautauqua Assembly

**COPYRIGHT, 1901, BY
CHAUTAUQUA ASSEMBLY**

The Lakeside Press, Chicago, Ill., U. S. A.
R. R. Donnelley & Sons Company

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION¹

The modern Kingdom of Prussia owed its position as one of the two great states of Germany to Frederick II., called "the Great." The Seven Years' War, in which he withstood the combined attack of Austria, Russia, and France, had added greatly to the possessions of Prussia and forced her recognition as one of the powers of Europe. At his death, in 1786, Prussia was as supreme in North Germany as Austria was in the south.

The reign of his successor, Frederick William II., is of interest chiefly in connection with the French Revolution and the second and third partitions of Poland. In 1792, a Prussian and Austrian force invaded France on behalf of Louis XVI., but the disaster to the allied armies and the reviving jealousy of Austria and Prussia cooled Prussian zeal in the cause, and in 1795 she withdrew from the coalition and made peace with France. The second and third partitions of Poland, in 1793 and 1795, completed the destruction of that country and increased Prussian possessions in the east.

In the reign of Frederick William III., Prussia paid for her coolness in the French struggle by becoming first the tool and then the victim of Napoleon's schemes of conquest. Deliberately provoked to war

¹ Adapted from "Governments of the World To-Day," by Hamblen Sears.

by Napoleon, Prussia suffered the terrible defeat of Jena, in 1806, and in the Treaty of Tilsit, 1807, was despoiled of half her territory and reduced to a secondary state. But her revenge came in heading the European rising against Napoleon after his disastrous Russian campaign of 1812, and in the division of spoils that followed his fall in 1815 Prussia had her share. In return for the Polish territory that had gone to the tsar in the Treaty of Tilsit, Prussia received a more than compensating accession of German lands, and was able once more to contest with Austria on equal terms the supremacy in Germany.

The history of Germany since 1815 has been one of continual growth from monarchical toward constitutional government, and of the unity of the many Central European states under one head.

At the outbreak of the French Revolution, Germany was a composite of nearly three hundred petty states, principalities, and cities loosely bound by ties of race, but without political unity other than that found in the Holy Roman Empire, of which they were members, and to whose head, the Archduke of Austria, they owed a merely figurative allegiance. Even this was ended by the abandoning of the title of "emperor" by Francis Joseph in 1806, and Napoleon's policy of dividing Germany was thus rendered more certain of success.

After Napoleon had fallen, the Congress of Vienna was called together to settle all European disputes and to define boundaries. Then came a federation of the German states under the guidance of a Diet of sixty-five members and a committee of seventeen, which

filled the places of an Upper and Lower House. Austria presided at all sittings, and the powers of these two bodies were curtailed as much as possible in order to leave greater independence to the individual states. In time of war the federation was to put itself under the guidance of the Diet entirely, and this central authority settled the difficulties between the states. The kingdoms of Denmark and the Netherlands had each a membership. Owing to the unsettled condition of affairs and the incomplete powers given it, the federation soon lost caste.

It was not long before a reaction from the settlements agreed upon by the sovereigns at the Vienna Congress set in, and the people of Germany began to think and act for themselves. The students all over the north and south of Germany formed a party of reform, demanding free press, universal suffrage, individual constitutions, etc., and in 1818 they won a constitution in Bavaria. In the next year Würtemberg followed Bavaria's example. To curtail this republican tendency, Metternich, prime minister of Austria, called the Carlsbad Congress in August, where the monarchical idea was enforced. Censorship of the press followed, and the rule of princes was pushed forward on all sides. From that time until 1830 there was a conflict between the two parties, ever growing stronger and fiercer. On the whole, through the influence of Metternich, the monarchical idea gained the ascendancy. He formed a union between Austria, Prussia, and Russia, called the "Holy Alliance," which had for its object the destruction of constitutions and the enforcement of the rule of irresponsible

ministries. Assemblies were closed, the rights of the press were curtailed, and in all parts of Germany the student element of free thought was suppressed.

All through the years from 1830 to 1848 there came individual cries for freedom of speech and suffrage. It was the modern demand of each man to be allowed to govern himself, a demand which, finding expression in the French Revolution, had become the common platform of popular movements in all Europe, and which the reactionary course of statesmen and rulers after 1815 had not been able to stifle. Along with this demand for greater political freedom had developed a strong impulse toward a united Germany.

There were three plans for this union which received the adhesion of different elements: 1. The republican plan, advocated by the extremists, the uncompromising adherents to the doctrines of the French Revolution; 2. The national plan, held by the political theorists who relied on an appeal to the German national spirit; 3. The plan of union under the leadership of one of the powerful states of Germany. This plan may be said to have been that of the practical politicians.

The French revolts of 1830 and 1848 had been the opportunity of the German republicans, and the failure of their attempts had shown to all but its supporters the inadequacy of their plan for the union of Germany. The next effort, therefore, was made by the National party. A great parliament was called, to meet at Frankfort, May, 1848, to frame a constitution for a united German state. The old Federal Diet gave way before this National Assembly, and on May

ist it inaugurated its work. But the problems it had to meet were of a political and practical nature, not to be settled by political theory. Having framed a constitution that in theory should satisfy the needs of the situation, it was found impossible to get it accepted by the powerful states. Frederick William IV. of Prussia, to whom the crown and title of Emperor of Germany were offered, refused to accept unless the princes of the Confederation were to offer these honors, and were allowed to suggest changes in the constitution. This check was mate. The National Assembly had failed, and although it still endeavored to form a union of the smaller states that had accepted the constitution, it was finally dissolved, the last remnant being dispersed in June, 1849. In 1850 the old Diet was restored by Austria, and Germany was seemingly no nearer union than before.

There was still left untried the plan of uniting Germany under one of the great states of the Confederation, a union that could be brought about only by the methods of practical politics. One of the chief difficulties of the National Assembly of Frankfort had been the question of Prussia and Austria. If Austria were admitted with her subject peoples, she would rule Germany. If Austria were excluded, or only her German population admitted, Prussia would dominate. This same rivalry was now to bring about a struggle for control that was to result in the union of Germany.

At first Prussia, under the weak rule of Frederick William IV., was forced to yield to Austria, who restored the old Diet under her own presidency. But with the accession of King William in 1861, and the

appointment of Otto, Count von Bismarck, to the position of minister in 1862, Prussia's position began to change. King and minister worked together toward a common end, the predominance of Prussia and union of Germany under Prussia.

Two wars mark the completion of the two chief parts or stages of the plans—the Schleswig-Holstein War, which forced Austria to retire from the field, and the Franco-Prussian War, in which Prussia, by defeating the traditional enemy of Germany, became the representative of German national spirit.

The Schleswig-Holstein question arose over the conflicting claims of Denmark and the German Confederation to these duchies. In the final arrangement Prussia and Austria occupied the two duchies in behalf of the Diet. Such proximity afforded an easy opportunity for disagreement, and in 1866 war was forced on Austria by Bismarck. The result was the total defeat of Austria in a seven-weeks' campaign, and her consequent retirement from German politics, on the one hand, and the annexation of Hanover, Hesse, and Schleswig-Holstein to Prussia, and the formation of the North German Confederation under Prussian control, on the other.

The Franco-Prussian War was immediately the result of French jealousy of the growth of Prussia in Germany. But although France thus appears as the aggressor and Germany as the defender, the position of the leading spirits on either side is the reverse; for there is abundant evidence that Napoleon III. was desirous of avoiding war with Prussia, and that Bismarck was ready and eager for war with France as the

means to the last step in his far-seeing plan. War was declared by France July 25, 1870. The overwhelming defeat of French arms on the Rhine, the surrender of Napoleon III. at Sedan to King William September 2d, the entry of Paris by the German army, and the proclamation of the German Empire under Emperor William I. in Versailles, were the spectacular features of this dramatic war. France ceded Alsace and Lorraine and engaged to pay an enormous war indemnity. The union of Germany was completed.

The constitution of the empire, adopted at the close of the war with Austria in 1867, was accepted with few changes on April 16, 1871, by all the twenty-five states of the empire. It is unique in history, being as it is a union of states of different forms of government under an hereditary head with imperial powers. After the preamble and the list of states in the Confederation, the constitution provides that all federal laws take precedence over state laws. Equal rights are to be held by citizens of all the states. The matters over which the legislative part of the government has jurisdiction are then classified under fifteen heads. They include all jurisdiction in the matter of posts and telegraph, railroads, waterways, military and naval affairs, measures of public health, and a common system of weights, measures, and money; also the establishment of measures relating to the rights of citizens and foreigners within the empire, or their movements between the states or into and away from the frontier; the establishment of laws for the purpose of revenue and customs or internal taxes, of banking, patent and copyright laws, and the protection of

German commerce abroad by consular representation; finally, the establishment of a common code for the punishment of crime and for civil procedure, the enforcement of judicial documents in the different states, and the protection and care of traffic on interstate waterways and roads. The legislative part of the imperial government is in two houses, the Federal Council (Bundesrath) and the House of Representatives (Reichstag).

The Bundesrath is composed of sixty-two members, who are appointed by the governments of the different states, each state having a certain number in proportion to its magnitude and having only the number of votes equal to its membership. Any member may propose motions, and the president must bring them before the body. The chancellor of the empire is the president, and the Bundesrath sits with closed doors. It appoints seven permanent committees, viz., army, navy, taxation, commerce, railways, post and telegraph, justice, and finance, and the appointments are so arranged that two states at least are represented in each committee exclusive of the president.

The Bundesrath meets annually, and no man can be a member of both houses at once, though the members of the Upper House can take seats in the Reichstag.

The Reichstag meets annually also, and is composed of three hundred and ninety-seven members elected by universal suffrage, about one to every one hundred and seventeen thousand; but if a member receives any government office, he must be reëlected to the Reichstag. The debates are public, and *verbatim* reports are published. The Reichstag can propose measures and

send them up to the Bundesrath, as well as any petitions submitted to it. Its term is five years (before 1890 three years). It can only be dissolved by a vote of the Bundesrath, and must then be summoned within sixty days, and meet again within ninety days of dissolution. The Reichstag regulates the power of its members under the constitution, and the members while in active service are free from any indemnity or arrest, unless taken in the act. All votes are by absolute majority of the total number of members, and as each member represents the whole country he cannot be held by any decree of his electors or of any one else. No member, as such, receives any salary.

The supreme authority is hereditary in the crown of Prussia, and the emperor has the right to receive and credit foreign ambassadors and emissaries, curtailed somewhat by the advice and consent of the Bundesrath. He calls the Bundesrath and Reichstag together and dismisses them. He appoints the chancellor of the empire, and with him the ministers of state. The emperor sees to the execution of the laws after they have passed both houses, and he has the power to bring forward bills in the Reichstag and in the Bundesrath. In his office of executor of the decrees of the legislatures, he has authority to carry them out in all the states, even to the use of force.

In the matter of customs the empire is a unit, and all legislation is for all parts of the country, except in the free cities of Hamburg, Bremen, and Lübeck, and they are at present free within their small city limits. Federal authority, also, has the legislation of tariff and excise on all kinds of produce. The expenses are

estimated by a budget voted by the two houses in advance and submitted annually. In case of need, the exchequers of the several states may be drawn upon or a loan negotiated by the passage of a federal law. The emperor is obliged to render an account of receipts and expenditures annually.

There is a circuit court (Amtsgericht) in each large township, over which are Landsgerichte with a right of revision over the decisions of the Amtsgerichte. The Oberlandsgerichte stand above these in turn, and are twenty-seven in number, extending over certain large tracts of land that sometimes include several states. The final court of appeals and for trial of cases of treason—the supreme court of the empire—is situated at Leipzig, where there are seventy-nine judges, appointed by the emperor with the consent of the Bundesrath. They are divided into four criminal and six civil senates.

The emperor as the executor of the empire appoints the ministers, who are responsible, and who by custom resign when a vote is passed in both houses against them, or when their advice is not followed. These have charge under the chancellor of the different departments of state. They are: the minister of foreign affairs, minister of interior, of justice, of finance, of the post and telegraph, and of the navy. These ministers do not, however, constitute a cabinet, because much work is done by the permanent committees in the Bundesrath.

The German army is the most thoroughly organized and scientifically arranged body of men in the world. It is composed in time of peace of 528,000

men and 18,750 officers, and in time of war is estimated at 5,000,000, counting all branches. These are divided into nineteen corps d'armée, besides a Prussian guard, and they are distributed through the empire, eleven in Prussia and the rest among the other states. Every German who is seventeen years old and able-bodied is liable under the constitution of the empire to service, and but for the peace limit would be obliged to serve seven years—three in active service and four in the reserves. Besides these seven years, he is obliged to belong to the Landwehr for five years more and to appear for drill for several weeks during each year. Owing to the necessity of having the army distinctly under one head, the Reichstag votes the money for its support once in seven years instead of annually. This is known as the Septennate. Germany has seventeen fortified towns of the first class and nineteen more of different sizes and strength, and they are connected by underground telegraph wires and by a strategic system of railroads.

Since 1871, the German navy has had a large growth. The increase in colonial possessions has called for a navy to protect German commerce and German interests abroad. There were in 1899, 327 ships, with 21,000 men.

The state constitutions of Germany have come down from feudal times, and they have, therefore, totally different traditions and sources. The final union in 1871 found a heterogeneous group of independent states, therefore, so jealous of their prerogatives that it was necessary to make as few changes as possible in each case. The Prussian constitution,

however, is a sufficiently good example to suggest the others. In the early part of the century there existed only an irresponsible ministry, as in all German duchies, with a council appointed by the king. After the revolution in March, 1849, came the grant from Frederick William IV. of a constitution. It went into effect in January, 1850, and remains substantially the same to-day, supplying a basis for the formation of the imperial government. The king appoints a council, including a president—since 1871 he is also chancellor of the empire—a vice-president, and a minister of the interior, a secretary of state for the interior, a minister of war, of public works, of agriculture, of justice, of worship and finance, and these are all responsible to and removable by the king.

The Herrenhaus, or the House of Lords, includes princes, nobles, distinguished persons raised to the peerage, representatives of the universities and of the church, and burgomasters of the large towns. There are also some members appointed by the crown not necessarily for life. The Abgeordnetenhaus contains four hundred and thirty-two members, elected at the rate of one for every sixty-six thousand inhabitants. Their system of elections is, however, different from that in the empire; for the citizens vote by classes for electors, who in turn vote for the representatives, instead of having direct suffrage by the people.

The other states of the empire are governed by constitutions which vary in many details as a result of diverse social and political conditions.

Alsace and Lorraine, acquired as a result of the Franco-Prussian War of 1871, are imperial provinces

directly under the rule of the federal Parliament, and presided over in the name of the emperor by a stadtholder and an Upper House of twelve members appointed by the emperor for three years. There is a Lower House of fifty-eight members elected by a limited suffrage. The inhabitants until within a few years have voted bodily against the empire and their enforced allegiance, and in the Reichstag their fifteen representatives have, until 1887, voted unanimously against the government; but of late there are signs of a division of opinion among them, though the majority is still strong against the government.

The history of Germany since 1871 is best followed briefly in the three or four important questions which have consumed the attention of all interested in the political growth of the empire. After 1871 it became the work of the government to foster the unity and peace of the empire. Under the aged Emperor William I., and Prince Bismarck as chancellor, the establishment of a universal system of money, weights, and measures was the first work. These acts had to be discussed in the Reichstag, and the feeling in the south of Germany, still strong against Prussia, added to the difference of faith, quickly created several parties among the members. The Prussian members, strongly in favor of the government, formed the Conservative; the Catholics formed what has been called the Center; those desiring a more liberal interpretation of the laws of press censorship, worship, education, etc., formed the National-Liberal party, and gradually the old republican-student sentiment throughout the empire created a party called the Social Democracy,

which includes many of the dissatisfied and radical members. There are several subdivisions, but these four parties substantially represent the great party divisions.

In 1887, to secure the passage of the seven-year budget for the army, the Conservatives, the National-Liberals, and the German Imperialists combined at the elections in order to gain a greater number of voters and representatives. This Cartel, or *Bund*, was and is still called the Cartel party.

On the 9th of March, 1888, the emperor died. Prince Frederick, who succeeded him, had been suffering from what finally proved to be cancer of the larynx, and he survived his father only a few months, leaving behind little work done, but having called forth a great veneration from his subjects on account of his peaceful, lenient spirit and his deep love for his countrymen's welfare. He died June 15, 1888, and was succeeded by his son William, who took the title of William II. The young emperor is a soldier following the policy of his grandfather. He spent the first year and a half of his reign in traveling and visiting other crowned heads in Europe. In the spring of 1890 a disagreement between him and the aged chancellor caused Bismarck's resignation and the appointment of General von Caprivi, who had been chief of the admiralty for several years. In 1894, Caprivi was forced to resign his office of chancellor, and was succeeded by Prince von Hohenlohe, who in 1899 was succeeded by the present chancellor, Count von Bülow.

One of the most vexatious problems since the formation of the empire has been that of the position of

the Catholics and the pope with reference to the government throughout the empire.

The formation of the Center, or Catholic party, was the commencement of the struggle. It originated from the refusal of the emperor, in 1871, to acknowledge the doctrine that the pope was infallible and that he had the right claimed under the old empire to enforce decrees in temporal matters contrary to the laws of the empire. The specific cause of the trouble grew out of several acts similar to that of the bishop of Eruland, who excommunicated a man who refused to give credence to the infallibility doctrine. The bishop was summarily dismissed from his office by the state because of his contempt for its authority, and then followed the dismissal of the Catholic department in the ministry of public worship and education. Herr Falk, on January 17, 1872, was appointed to succeed Muehler in the position of minister of education and worship, because he was more in sympathy with the government. Then began a series of legislative acts replacing the authority of the state where the Catholic clergy had exercised power over people of their faith in temporal matters. A law for the inspection of schools by the state was passed first. At this the pope refused to receive Cardinal Hohenlohe as German ambassador in May, and when in June the Jesuits and similar branches of the Catholic Church were expelled from all Germany, the contest became an open one between the emperor and the pope. Was the imperial authority to be supreme, or was it to allow a power to exist in its midst that could successfully claim independence of imperial jurisdiction? The next ten years

was one long contest upon that point. In 1873, in the month of May, Herr Falk, at Bismarck's dictation, brought forward and carried in the Reichstag what are known as the May Laws, the repeal of which was the one task of the Center party in the Reichstag from that time forth. These May Laws made the discharge and exile of bishops legal when they acted against the decrees of the existing government. They made it obligatory that every bishop be educated in a gymnasium or public high school, according to the regular German system, and they established an imperial court for the settlement of ecclesiastical difficulties. This last virtually took the decision in religious matters away from the church into the hands of the state. In 1874, a supplementary law, making it criminal for bishops who had been dismissed to persist in exercising their former prerogatives, was added to the list; for after the laws of 1873 the Catholic clergy, at the decree of the pope, had gone on with their work as before. Finally, in 1875, January 25th, a law was carried through the Reichstag establishing civil as well as religious marriage.

It became necessary to pass an act in March, 1875, prohibiting any payment to bishops who had not put in writing under oath their promise to obey all the laws of the state, and on February 10, 1876, the legislation against the Catholics finally reached its height in a law making it a criminal offense to use the pulpit for political purposes. Pius IX. issued an encyclical against the emperor, and denied his right to make any such decrees, and the affair seemed likely to take all the attention of the empire.

At this point there came a sudden change. Pius IX. died in 1877. Leo XIII. and his cardinal, Franchi, began in a more conciliatory manner, and then, too, the stability of the empire was much more firmly established than four years before. There began to appear in one section and another a desire for some settlement. In May, 1878, the government filled several unoccupied bishoprics, and Leo XIII. confirmed them all. At this time, several of the larger bishoprics were vacant, the press was under such a surveillance that the enforcement of the law caused constant imprisonments, and it became evident that the movement had gone too far. At the same time, in the Reichstag, Herr Windthorst, who was and had been since 1873 the indefatigable leader of the Catholics in all their opposition to Bismarck, had made so perfect a party organization of his followers that they could prevent any measure from going through the house that did not have the other parties unanimously on its side. It is partly due to this obstructive power and largely to Bismarck's desire to put through his bills for raising revenue and for bettering the condition of the laboring classes, especially the tobacco monopoly bills, that gradually an agreement was come to between Windthorst and himself, so that in 1879 mutual concessions became still more the order of the day. The pope granted the right of the government to demand allegiance to the civil laws from all bishops (the *Anzeigerpflicht*). The dismissal of Falk followed on July 13th, as a concession to the Catholics, for he had been their greatest enemy. In 1880 things began to promise better, when suddenly Cardinal Franchi died, and

Cardinal Nina, an enemy to Germany, became the diplomatic minister of the church, and affairs came to a standstill again. Gradually, however, more concessions were wrung from Prussia, and the enforcement of the May Laws was largely put into the emperor's hands, with the power of using his personal judgment with regard to their strict interpretation. The fight could not be kept up, since the Center could prevent the government from doing anything else. It is, however, false to say that the spirit that had caused the May Laws in 1874 had completely died out. The stability of the empire was less uncertain now and the necessity for other legislation was more important. In 1881 the ambassador to the Holy See was reappointed, and the pope made some concessions. The Center joined the Conservatives in 1884, and Bismarck had his long-sought majority for his revenue laws, so that in 1886 the Kulturkampf was just where it had been in 1873, except that the Catholics had a party upwards of a hundred strong under splendid drill. An act was then carried taking away the law requiring that the bishops be examined by the state. After 1887, Herr Windthorst took every occasion to state the principles of his party, not with any immediate hope of bringing about their adoption, but to keep the matter before the Reichstag. He demanded the absolute authority of the pope in matters spiritual within the empire, which implied the annihilation of the whole legislation since 1872. The death of their leader in March, 1891, was a great loss to the party. Windthorst had been firm and consistent since 1873 in his demands, and it cannot be denied that he totally

defeated the government and almost brought the Catholics back to the position they occupied before the formation of the empire. His death has seriously weakened the Center.

Prince Bismarck in his contest with the Ultramontane party had joined himself with the Liberals to secure a large enough majority to defeat the one hundred members of the Center in 1878. He had also previous to 1873 encouraged the socialist feeling among the more radical members of the Liberal party for the same reason. Lassalle had been a great friend of his up to the time of his death. Consequently the little party, representing some three hundred thousand voters in the large cities of Germany, became toward 1876 a more noticeable feature in the Reichstag. While acknowledging the German emperor and their allegiance to him, they stipulated as their guiding principle the absolute freedom of the press, regulation of the hours of labor, public education, self-government, and adjustment of the relations of labor and capital. Such a party must necessarily contain most of the dissatisfied portion of any community, and there are, therefore, among the Social Democrats many who believe in community of goods, abolition of marriage, etc. They, however, do not represent the better class of electors in the party of the Reichstag. Under the patronage of the chancellor and the growth of the sentiment among the laboring classes, the little party grew until the government saw the necessity of checking it. It was just at this time that the two attempts on the emperor's life were made. He was riding one day in May, 1878, on the Unter den Linden, when one

Hoedel shot twice at him without wounding him, and on June 2d a man named Dr. Nobiling wounded him in the face. A cry at once arose all over the empire charging the socialists with the instigation of the crime, and this became sufficient cause for legislation against them.

There were at the time about sixty thousand socialists in Berlin and perhaps a half million in the empire. They had thirty-five newspapers and periodicals, and a large number of associations. In the Reichstag twelve members had been elected in 1877, and Herr Bebel, the leader, managed with his little body of followers to create considerable commotion at times. A bill was at once brought in against the socialists, but it called forth the censure of the Liberals, because it pointed in several clauses to the absolute suppression of free speech in the empire and left to local authorities to decide what was "socialist" matter and what not, with the power to suppress it if they saw fit. On the 21st of October a modified bill was passed, but was restricted to three years. All the socialist meetings and newspaper organs were to be suppressed. In Berlin alone on the first day four organizations and thirty-five periodicals were stopped. The same plan was followed throughout the empire. On May 31, 1881, the law was renewed for three years more without any material change. The little party remained about the same, but the beginning of Bismarck's policy for raising the revenue by the tobacco tax, making it a government monopoly in Germany, drew upon him the censure of all Liberals, and among them the socialists, and thus the latter's vote came to be of more impor-

tance to him. In 1887 the feeling was still more in favor of the Social Democrats, and it was with difficulty that the law was again passed. The party had eleven members in the Reichstag, and their votes in the empire numbered something over a million. Labor unions and strikes occurred in spite of the authorities, and the Social Democrats returned to the Reichstag in 1890 with a party of thirty-six members. Publishing houses had been started in Zurich and in Geneva, and quantities of pamphlets were circulated from one end of the country to the other under the very eyes of the law. With such a growth the socialist law could not compete when in January and February, 1890, it came up for discussion again. A very much modified bill was proposed, and failed on the third reading, so that on the 1st of October, 1890, the social democratic legislation and laws went back to the status of 1878. Nothing like freedom of speech is permitted, but meetings can be held and periodicals issued to a certain extent, and the emperor has distinctly recognized the claims of the laboring classes and the necessity for some legislation in their behalf. In his treatment of the question and in Caprivi's policy in regard to the legislation for the lower classes, Germany has taken the foremost ground in government socialism within recent years. To-day, in spite of suppression, the social democracy stands with two able men at its head, Bebel and Liebknecht, and a party of magnificent organization over a million strong.

In 1881, William I. said in his message to the Reichstag that he was going to inaugurate a system of laws that should make the social condition of the

poor better. This proposal has crystallized into three compulsory insurance acts. 1. The first is known as the Act of Insurance against Sickness. 2. The second act, known as the Compulsory Insurance against Accident, was proposed and carried in 1884-85. It was at first confined to men working for the government, but has been extended to the different trades. 3. The third law has recently been under discussion in the Reichstag. It is a system of old age and infirmity insurance which is compulsory.

These three acts embody in themselves a principle of socialism in its theoretical sense that makes them the most pronounced practical acts toward socialism that have been passed by any great power. They involve a matter of the deepest interest, coming as they do with the emperor's words at different times during the last few years.

The part of Germany in European history since 1871 may be traced in the European alliances. After the formation of the German Empire, Austria, recognizing the fact as inevitable, abandoned all thought of a German policy and turned her attention, as advised by Bismarck, to the East. Thus the antagonism of these two powers ceased and friendly relations were established. The personal friendship between the Tsar of Russia and Emperor William was influential in bringing about what was then called the "alliance of the three emperors," in reality an alliance resting on no treaty between Russia, Germany, and Austria. This endured until the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78, by which the friendly feeling between Russia and the other two empires was ended, Austria especially being

forced to recognize a necessary rival in Russia in the East. The Congress of Berlin, called to consider the means of keeping European peace and settling the question of the Balkan provinces, showed both the prominent position of Germany in international relations and the need of new combination.

The result of the changed situation was to divide Europe along lines which have in the main endured until to-day. Germany, Austria, and Italy formed in 1883 the Triple Alliance. England, from her rivalry of Russia in Asia, leaned toward this alliance, while France was forced by her traditional enmity of Germany to take the side of Russia.

The modern German colonial system began in 1884. The growth of the knowledge of Africa and the interest taken in colonial possession by France and England had much to do with inducing Prince Bismarck to open a channel for colonial possession in that continent. The enormous emigration of Germans to the United States and elsewhere was one of the causes also. The government sought some method of keeping Germans under German rule.

The colonial possessions and the protectorates of Germany are at present as follows:

| <i>In West Africa:</i> | <i>Sq. miles.</i> | <i>Inhabitants.</i> |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Togoland, Porto Seguro, Little Popo- | 16,000 | 500,000 |
| Cameroons----- | 130,000 | 2,600,000 |
| <i>In South Africa:</i> | | |
| Damaraland, Namaqualand, and An- | | |
| gra Pequena----- | 342,000 | 250,000 |
| <i>In East Africa:</i> | | |
| Usagara, Uhaim, Nguru, and Usequa | 60,000 } | 1,760,000 |
| Other territories----- | 233,520 } | |

| <i>In the Pacific:</i> | <i>Sq. miles.</i> | <i>Inhabitants.</i> |
|---------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Kaiser Wilhelm Land..... | 72,000 | 110,000 |
| Bismarck Archipelago..... | 19,000 | 190,000 |
| Solomon Islands..... | 9,000 | 80,000 |
| Marshall Islands..... | 150 | 10,000 |
| Total | 881,670 | 5,500,000 |

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. When did Prussia become recognized as one of the powers of Europe?
2. What important events marked the reign of Frederick William II.?
3. What did Prussia lose and what gain from Napoleon's career?
4. What was the condition of Germany at the outbreak of the French Revolution?
5. What was the nature of the federation of German states?
6. How was the influence of Metternich felt up to 1830?
7. What impulse was felt throughout Europe from 1830 to 1848?
8. What three plans for union were being considered in Germany?
9. What was the result of the efforts at union made by the National Assembly?
10. How did the relative positions of Prussia and Austria work against German unity?
11. What two wars gave Prussia the advantage, and how?
12. What are the chief features of the German constitution?
13. In what respects is it unique?
14. Describe the Bundesrath.
15. Describe the Reichstag.
16. What powers are placed in the hands of the emperor?
17. How are the expenses of the empire provided for?
18. Give some important facts relating to the German army.

19. Describe the plan of the constitution of Prussia.
20. What are the two Prussian legislative bodies ?
21. How does the position of Alsace and Lorraine differ from that of the other states ?
22. What are the general characteristics of the four leading political parties ?
23. Describe the struggle over the Catholic question up to 1877.
24. Describe events after that date.
25. Why was legislation against the socialists thought necessary ?
26. What measures were adopted, and with what result ?
27. What laws were passed under William I. to better the social condition of the people ?
28. How has Germany's position in Europe since 1871 been shown by her alliances ?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Frederick the Great. Longman.

Frederick the Great. Carlyle.

History of Prussia. Tuttle.

Founding of the German Empire. Von Sybel.

Political History of Europe since 1814. Seignobos.

History of Modern Europe. Fyffe.

(See also bibliographies under the following chapters.)



IMPERIAL GERMANY

CHAPTER I

THE GERMAN CHARACTER IN POLITICS

Nie war gegen das Ausland
Ein anderes Land gerecht wie Du ;
Sei nicht allzu gerecht ! Sie denken nicht edel genug,
Zu sehn, wie schön Dein Fehler ist.¹

—*Klopstock.*

I

Eighteen centuries ago Tacitus exclaimed, "May the Germans, as they cannot love us, at least retain their hatred of each other, so that, when Rome begins to totter, she may at least find support in the discord of that race."

On March 23, 1887, Bismarck said in the Prussian Herrenhaus (House of Lords), "The German lives by quarreling with his countrymen."

The opinion held by the Roman historian, coinciding almost word for word with that of the greatest German politician of our time, might well illustrate the undying tenacity of popular characteristics, and banish optimistic expectations from the recent constellation of German greatness.

¹ Ne'er was a people just towards the stranger as thou art.
Be not too just; they think not nobly enough to see
How fair thy failing is.

Allied to this traditional incapacity for united action, history records a strange unreadiness for action of any decisive kind. The French knew this by experience, and always associated the idea of unreadiness with the Germans—they were always waiting to be attacked. Napoleon aptly suggested this in a letter during one of his campaigns. "Send me biscuits and brandy for fifty thousand men; it is easy enough to beat the Germans, but not without the biscuits," etc. Ludwig Börne tells us a German will wear his coat threadbare while making up his mind whether to have a new button sewn on it. Their sayings, "Nach und nach" (Little by little), "Eile mit Weile" (Haste with leisure), reflect this national idiosyncrasy.

Thus Shakespeare is supposed to have portrayed the typical German in Hamlet—the philosophizing prince, who utters the wisest axioms without being able to bring himself to act upon them.

If this portrayal be true, then an explanation is found for the fact that the Germans could never help themselves until men were found at the head of affairs who united the idealism of a Hamlet with the bold decision of an Anglo-Saxon Cromwell.

More than this, the salvation of Germany had to come through a people that was not purely German by race. Bismarck himself stated his conviction that to the admixture of Slavonic blood in the old Prussian provinces are due those blind, dog-like, tough qualities of devotion and obedience that enabled Frederick the Great to win his famous battles, and thus to lay the foundation of Prussia's hegemony of to-day.

The inhabitants of the old provinces of Prussia are in unity of patriotism and power of recovery more like the French than those of any other part of Germany.

This material, led by genius, has always done its work cleanly. It met the Austrians at Leuthen, in the slanting battle-line of Epaminondas, thirty-six thousand against eighty-five thousand. It drove the French like hares at Rossbach. The French never properly realized this, and only remembered Jena, when this same material, defectively organized and led by hopeless imbecility, went down before the greatest captain of the age. The French remembered the Germans only as a disunited herd, that always waited to be attacked and never took the offensive. They forget that those days are gone forever, since Prussia, who always took the initiative, leads the van. The defensive is an Austrian specialty; it is typical of that brave, but unready, indolent nation which in 1866, true to its old instincts, gloated over its cleverness in enticing the Prussians into Bohemia in order to eat them on arrival.

Formerly, this Austrian characteristic distinguished all Germany; to-day, Prussia is striving hard to eradicate it. Yet even now, wherever Prussia is not directly administrative, a trace of that delightful little German quality, procrastination or unreadiness, shows its cloven foot, not to mention the still older idiosyncrasy of discord and doctrinarism. This leads us to believe that if the Prussians had not brought the Germans salvation they would never have had it, and that without Prussia's guidance they would forfeit

it again to-morrow and let their country once more become the battle-field of Europe.

Yet these procrastinating, unready Austrians were always popular with the masses in the same proportion as the Prussians were disliked, even in provinces such as those of the Rhine, which but recently came under Prussian sway. Only the intellectual few long ago recognized the superb qualities of honesty, economy, order, and devotion to duty which everywhere marked the Prussian administration. Thus the recognition has been a slow process based on respect, the safest of foundations. And those who turned their sympathies to Austria have had time to discover that, in this instance, the head offered little justification for the leanings of the heart.

It would seem that national characteristics—which, like all other characteristics, according to Darwin, must be the result of infinitely long-standing influences—die hard. Happily, a national character is not composed of one or even two unfortunate traits, but of many qualities, some of which neutralize or nullify the working of others. Thus the Germans, whom only yesterday we witnessed reddening their fields with blood in fratricidal strife, we have beheld in our time thronging around the great Emperor William in a genuine outburst of patriotic ideality, ready to call out, "Hail, Cæsar, we, about to die, salute thee!"

All well-wishers of Germany must hope that this genuine feeling of patriotism will long form a rallying-point around which all shall gather who are prepared to do and die for their country.

II

It is a peculiar fact, and one that speaks highly for the intellectual capacities of the race, that, whereas all times and many countries have produced severe critics of the German character, the bitterest censors have been found among eminent Germans themselves. The nation of thinkers and critics has indeed produced severe critics of themselves—anatomists who have studied the anatomy of character from their own body politic. It is scarcely necessary to do more than mention the names of Frederick the Great, Lessing, Goethe, Schopenhauer, and recently, Bismarck himself. These men have accused the nation of its dilatory failings, its doctrinarism, and its tendency to discord. And yet this very German people has always had a word of appreciation, sometimes even an extravagant admiration, for the good qualities of other nations.

Yet it is only fair to ask: May not this old-time incapacity of rallying around one central personage, this doctrinarism, be the unfortunate result of that anxious and hopeless pondering over and striving for an impossible ideal which has enabled the Germans to achieve such wonders in the fields of science and philosophy? Has not this politically unfortunate characteristic been intensified by exceptionally unfavorable historical circumstances? And may we not assume that the fact that the old German Empire was an elective kingdom for so long a period largely fostered national discord?

There is only one other example of an elective king-

dom in history with which to draw a parallel, and in the very mention of its name the moral is self-evident—Poland! The incapacity of the exalted few in whose hands the national destinies were collectively placed, to subordinate their pretensions to rule to the claim of any one family in the interests of all, has had in both instances similar, though fortunately not equal, results.

Surely there is something interesting and instructive in the above, for there is no denying the long-standing popular longing for national unity. Does not the legend of the Emperor Barbarossa bear witness to it? Does not a gleam of romance break through the Middle Ages and show us the ideal figure of the Hohenstaufen emperor Frederick II. (A. D. 1250)? And has not popular sentiment woven a wreath of undying poetry around the person of this cultured and unfortunate champion of national greatness against papal supremacy?

Since that time the Germans have ever been fighting for union, and often in the agony of strife have they forgotten what they were striving for, and thought only of feud and battle.

III

After the death of the Emperor Frederick II. of Hohenstaufen, the power of the petty princes and of the aristocracy increased so immeasurably that there failed to rise to the surface any one lasting predominant influence. The German king and emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, elected from the many rulers, was always powerless to further the consolidation of

national unity. Yet the national longing still survived, and embodied itself in the myth of the Kyffhäuser, where Barbarossa sat in somnolent state, guarded by ravens, biding the time of the reawakening of national unity and splendor.

We require an effort of the imagination even to recall that there was a time when the German emperor ruled a country on which the sun ne'er set, when Germany was the home of merchant princes who helped their monarch from their private means,¹ when German architecture was the most splendid, when German life was the most luxurious, and German manufactures the most renowned. It was the time of Charles V. of Hapsburg, when France's king was Germany's prisoner, when Spain, with its newly discovered American possessions, and the whole center of Europe, from the Netherlands to the frontier of Poland to the east and unto the Alps to the south, bowed to German sway.

That was the moment for a great political figure to appear, and, rallying the nation around it, to consolidate a strong hereditary empire in the center of Europe. The dawn of a new era full of bright hope had begun, for Luther had appeared on the scene, and, single-handed, stood his ground against the powers of Rome. "Yes, I will go to Worms, even if the housetops are crowded with devils," said this mighty German. A spiritual Bismarck was there to point to a new God, but the Hapsburg emperor was no King William to draw the sword in his name.

¹The rich Fuggers of Augsburg, who assisted Charles V. with their wealth.

Thus the Reformation, instead of uniting Germany, led to its deepest political degradation—the Thirty Years' War—out of which it emerged with its population reduced from sixteen millions to less than five, and with a loss of national wealth from which it has even now only partially recovered.

For centuries the kaiser was more or less a foreign potentate. The national feeling longed for a German kaiser, not for a Spaniard or even an Austrian. Through long ages the Germans were like the fragments in a kaleidoscope, without cohesion, yet presenting brilliant, unexpected pictures, rarely colored, but repeated at the will of a stranger. Bismarck has said, "The Germans are capable of everything if once anger or necessity should unite them."

This we have seen to be true, but it wanted the uniting central personalities, and only when these came could the best capacities of the race find expression. That an indomitable spirit worthy of a great nation was never wanting is proved by history. The fighting capacities and fidelity of even mercenaries of German blood at all times and in all parts of the world—in Rome, the Italian republics, and America—are attested by many writers. Even in recent times, when Napoleon I. was deserted by his followers, those with German names were most true to him. When in 1821 the news reached Paris of the death of Napoleon at St. Helena, General Rapp, one of his most faithful Alsatian followers, burst into tears. It was in a crowded drawing-room, and everybody present immediately withdrew from the vicinity of the sturdy Teuton and left him standing alone in his honest grief.

The company included many who had served Napoleon in his time, but one and all were afraid of showing sympathy with their dead master. This German militant fidelity (*Deutsche Treue*) is no vain boast, though through the lack of unity it had little to hold to or to encourage it. In the Thirty Years' War, the Germans fought the battles of others. The Seven Years' War, which first gave Protestant Germany a chance, yet failed to afford a rallying-point to all.

Strange, indeed, it is that the rich German language, although it has a word for "patriotism," has none for "patriot." Yet, strangely significant, it has even a word for being without a country, a unique word, *Vaterlandslos*, thus pointing to the history of its past.

IV

After Napoleon I. had made a clean sweep of the political chessboard, and he in his turn had vanished, to eat out his ambitious heart in a desert island, the difficulty still remained—whom to invest with the national aspirations. Had a Cavour arisen then to champion the nation's legitimate rights against the jealousy of the allied powers, Germany would certainly have annexed Alsace in 1815, Lorraine might still be French, and the War of 1870 might never have taken place!

However, the idea of unity, nurtured at all times at the universities, lived on among the true aristocrats of the nation, and among the best of every class, from the highest to the humblest. But it maintained itself most vigorously in the middle class, and stronger than

ever through the sad period of reaction from 1815 to 1848, it found popular vent in that noble song, "Was ist der Deutschen Vaterland?" which answered the question in the refrain:

Where'er the German tongue doth sound,
There must the Fatherland be found.

This national feeling culminated in the Revolution of 1848. The people asked not for a republic; they longed for unity. And its expression was not thrown away; although fruitless at the time, the Frankfort Parliament prepared the way for Prussia.

In the foreground stood Austria and Prussia, conscious of the national longing, jealously confronting each other. But until the latter had shown, as if by magic,

When Prussia's eagles swept fair Austria's lands

in seven days, that she could beat the former, few could discern in her the realizer of popular dreams. The hopeless misery of the past had left the petty fear of becoming "Prussianized" to obscure the greater goal: to rise through Prussia to a greater Germany.

Only when the late Emperor William had fulfilled the promise he held out in 1866, that he would hold the interests of Germany paramount and highest, did the gradual revolution of feeling become complete—the recognition by the vast majority that the national ideal had at last been in a great measure realized by Prussia.

Such are the broad outlines of fact bearing on the realization of the national longing for unity. Yet it would be gross superficiality to think that the lucky

rolling of the iron dice alone brought it about. When Napoleon I. vanquished Prussia and humbled her to the dust in one day, the best qualities of a nation awoke from a long sleep.

Prussia was not allowed to keep a standing army above forty-two thousand men. Stein, Scharnhorst, and Von der Kneesebeck (a weighty man, little known to popular readers) planned a secret system by which the greater part of the male population was speedily drafted through the army between the years 1807 and 1813. This system was secretly and successfully carried out without coming to the knowledge of the French. A people that could act thus was worthy to form the nucleus of a new empire. It remains one of the grandest traits of national character in history, this instance of not one single traitor being found among a whole people. This effacement of the individual before the interests of the community runs like a red thread through the history of civil as well as of military Prussia. It found its highest manifestation in the year 1813, when six per cent of the entire population of Prussia rushed to arms—a proportion never before attained by any state, except, perhaps, that of Sparta.

It is in the grit of the Prussian character, and its gradual recognition by Germany as a whole, that we must seek the real key to what the thoughtless crowd would put down as the mere natural results of fortunate soldiering alone.

The House of Hohenzollern has fostered the hardiest qualities of a strong, hardy race, and forged a sword for it. The genius of its leaders has guided the working out of its highest destiny in our time.

V

German unity has been fought for and gained in spite of desperate opposition from within and from without; it has still to encounter many more or less inimical influences from within. In addition to the difficulties arising from unfitness of character were differences of institutions, both social and legal. The North, principally Protestant, is still in part intensely aristocratic, and recently has been honeycombed by socialism; whereas the West and the South, which felt the waves of the French Revolution, are democratic, besides being largely Catholic. There are millions of Germans who place their allegiance to the pope above that to their sovereign. It is German stubborn doctrinarism which makes this possible—instinctive doctrinarism in those who do not even know the meaning of the word. For Catholics in other countries have rarely allowed their religion to nullify their patriotism.

The pope himself soon dropped his attempts to side with the English government against the Irish peasants when the latter, through their Protestant representatives, plainly intimated that they would have none of his interference. But Irish patriotism is doubtless a hardier plant than German *Vaterlandsliebe* (love of country) has hitherto been. It is only in Germany that a man such as the late Dr. Windthorst, a sworn hater of Germany united under Prussia, could have the following he had.

But sentiments which owed their origin to Catholic or papal partisanship have often been taken up by

those who had no other excuse for sharing them than blind party passion and envy. They have often been adopted by men who were neither separatist Alsations nor Catholic Poles, but *bona-fide*, self-asserting Germans.

Because advocates of social reforms cannot have them carried out in their own way, jealousy bids them do their best to asperse the motives of others equally well intentioned as they themselves (though this must be admitted to be also a parliamentary characteristic nearer home). It is even on record that a Heidelberg professor of world-wide reputation, who had preached the gospel of unity all his life, rushed away to Italy in the sulks when it came in a form different from that which he had prescribed for it!

Because the "Iron Chancellor" was diffident of the practicability of the theories of political economy, which Liberal enthusiasts would have had him accept as the crowning of the state edifice, therefore every initiative of the state must be opposed, and this only too often in a petty venomous spirit. It is not so much opposition itself as the spirit of it which is to be deplored. The long-increasing hate and estrangement between the different political parties are already showing the incapacity of parliamentary government to harmonize the differences of feeling in the community; if anything, it only tends to accentuate them. Even if some of these elements do not direct their energies against unity itself, they have often been directed against the avowed policy of its immediate founders.

Still, we are in fairness bound to ask ourselves:

May not some of the opposition Bismarck always encountered in the execution of his far-seeing plans often have been an exaggerated manifestation of that independence of individual conscientious thought which will not yield itself captive even to the glamour of military prowess? And if it be so, can we help bestowing a mite of admiration, even where we feel bound to condemn its results?

Can we, again, refuse a tribute of respect when we meet such instances of personal unselfish devotion to a lost cause as from time immemorial every turn of the political wheel of fortune has called forth in Germany? We may deplore the attachment to a lost cause that obscures the vision for a broader and nobler one which has grown into a splendid reality, but we cannot condemn the instinct that blinds those to the future whose hearts unselfishly cling to a past, be it never so poor in the eyes of the onlooker.¹

But, besides opposition of the kind hinted at above, there remains much that cannot be put down either to noble or unselfish motives.

The petty but honest feeling of narrow state loyalty has been Germany's political curse, for it obscured the horizon of a broader national firmament; but the idea of unity has had other enemies to deal with. These, if not so powerful in the aggregate, have yet caused Germany's leaders many a pang of sorrow and disappointment. We mean that spirit of Philistinism, of envy and distrust, alternating with indifference, which only the stirring hours of a death-grapple cast

¹ Many of the faithful partisans of the late king of Hanover would, after 1866, have had only beggary to look forward to, had it not been for the far-sighted policy of reconciliation of Bismarck.

temporarily in the background. It comes to the front again in all its ugliness with the return of peace and security.

Such are some of the dangerous elements Germany will still have to grapple with when those mighty men have all passed away to whom the Fatherland is so immensely indebted.

VI

Misfortune has taught the Germans many a lesson, and doubtless benefited them; still, they have not passed through the fire of the past without the development of peculiarities of character which are more or less distinctly traceable to the sufferings they have endured.

It is difficult to believe that some of the petty failings of to-day were existent in the olden times of national splendor. In those days German life could not show that amount of littleness, of hypersensitiveness, of personal spite and petty malice and envy, which has often been noticed and deplored in later times.

Such qualities could not flourish amidst the pomp and panoply of national prosperity. They could only be the ugly offshoot born of oppression, poverty, and misery. And now that there seems a great future in store for Germany, her friends can but hope that qualities which owed their existence to misfortune—as disease owes its presence to dirt—will gradually disappear before the reawakening of the best instincts of a mighty race. This is the more to be wished for

as such qualities are largely answerable for the perpetuation of the oldest German national failing, discord. That a broader national feeling has steadily increased since 1870 is admitted on all sides. Yet these are not the only effects of victory; it has put many off their guard as to the dangers to be provided against in the future.

The history of a thousand years is not nullified by the victories of one generation, even though such victories be the result of a long-sustained system of discipline and a universal acceptance of heroic duty. The defects of the national character which bade Teutons themselves desert their national hero, Arminius, which enabled a Richelieu to sway the conduct of the Thirty Years' War, defects which have made Germans slavishly bow down to rulers whose titles were gained in return for the slaughter of their own countrymen¹—such may have been scotched, but they were not killed, at Sadowa or Sedan. Nor were they choked by the proclamation of the German Empire at Versailles.

The political pauperism of the past, the petty and half-dormant, if not torpid, social life of centuries, have generated idiosyncrasies that will only be gradually obliterated by sustained moral effort. The constant danger arising from these is intensified when we bear in mind what has just been noted—the social and political differences in the population of North and South.

The Germans are a sensitive people, and yet, with

¹The present titles of the rulers of Saxony, Bavaria, Württemberg, Baden, and Hesse-Darmstadt were the creations of Napoleon I. In each case they signify a step in advance on the previous one held by their possessors.

this and all their peculiarities, they possess a dispassionate impartiality of judgment in some things which is in many ways remarkable. The Germans often use the word *Objectivität* (objectiveness), and they have some reason for doing so. Bismarck accused them of being ashamed of their nationality abroad and of adopting the bad qualities of the people among whom they live. With regard to the first accusation, a foundation for it in the past cannot be denied. But there was also something to explain it; the national tendency to objectiveness explains it.

Germans abroad have generally come from a class that has more acute perceptions for material than for ideal advantages. Thus, in coming abroad, seeing larger practical and material conditions of life, they looked back with contempt on the petty parochial character of life in their native land; those that leave their country do not, as a rule, possess sufficient ideality to cherish their country for the sake of that quality, though there have been at all times exceptions. The German abroad becomes more practical, but he generally loses in a spiritual sense; he assimilates the utilitarian features of the country he lives in, only too often to lose touch with the ideality of his native land, which should make him prouder of his country than of her recent victories. This bewildering outward aspect of practical life in England and America also explains why traveling Englishmen are so often unable to appreciate what is in reality the strong side of German life—its mental and ethical culture. They see the outside only, and as this has hitherto been more striking in our country, the average

Englishman's opinion of Germany has ever been a shallow one.

This German objectiveness is shown in their estimate of their enemies. The English and French either hate and slander their enemies, or, when they have beaten them, hold them in contempt. Napoleon I. always felt a strong contempt for his enemies. Not so the Germans. They invariably speak with respect of their opponents, even be they those they have beaten—such as the Danes, the Austrians, and the French, or the Russians. It is perhaps one of their soundest national traits, from a military point of view, that they invariably overestimate their foes, for this characteristic has certainly not made them afraid to meet them. Even the inimitable Boulanger they at first took seriously, and only spoke of him with contempt when he showed characteristics that would have ruined him in twenty-four hours had he been a German.

Bearing the character of the military successes of Germany in mind, we have always been impressed with the "comparative" absence of national self-assertion.

The Prussians, who used to be considered individually and collectively arrogant and overbearing, even by the Germans themselves, have largely lost the reputation for these attributes now that their worth has been more generally recognized, for in the lack of honest recognition such qualities often have their origin. We shall deal with the Philistine by himself, but the more intelligent the individual we meet, the more moderate the views invariably held; and even

among the comparatively uncultured that senseless bounce which we often deplore in other nations is for the most part absent.

VII

Up to the present, whatever may be said to the contrary, chauvinism¹ is not a national German failing. Some affect to deplore the marked military—not to say nationally assertive—tendencies of the present emperor, and look back with regret to the liberal and humanitarian temperament of his father. But one thing seems certain: as long as in certain quarters humanitarianism and liberalism imply a possibility of yielding one inch of what has been gained by such sacrifices of blood and treasure, so long Germany cannot afford to indulge too readily in those excellent qualities. It is a sad truth, but it is an important one. That arch-wiseacre, General Ignatieff, has told the world that immediately after 1870 he ironically congratulated the Germans on having annexed “an open wound” in Alsace and Lorraine! As if the French did not harbor revenge against England during nearly half a century after Waterloo, although England did not despoil France of an inch of territory! but, on the contrary, did all in her power to prevent Germany generally from reaping the fruits of her enormous sacrifice in fighting the first Napoleon by retaking Alsace from the French. When will reasonable beings

¹ This term is derived from the name of a brave soldier, Nicholas Chauvin, who was so devoted to Napoleon I. and so demonstrative in the display of loyalty that the name has come to stand for an absurd or exaggerated patriotism and military enthusiasm.

be able to see that French vanity would have been as irrevocably wounded by the loss of one battle as by the loss of half a dozen provinces, and—the most important point—that she would have remained more powerful to resent it!

Immediately after the War of 1870, a brilliant Paris journalist, of German birth, Albert Wolff, wrote a book, gingerly putting the French in the wrong, but closing with the declaration that he was ashamed that his native land had not used its victory to be generous and forborne to wrest territory from France! It is indeed a sad inheritance from the past that such ideas should find serious acceptance. People never think of suggesting or expecting that the English, or the French, or the Russians, are going to forego the fruits of victory or to yield up the price of their blood. The Germans have a right to be taken with equal seriousness, and their well-wishers will not easily quarrel with the means they use to attain that legitimate end.

Let the Germans taboo the French language, let them decline to be addressed in that tongue. The time may come when it will be considered as inconsiderate to address Germans on equal conditions in any other language than their own as it is now the case with Frenchmen, Americans, or Englishmen. When that comes to pass, then the nonsense of treating political Germany as the poor boy of the nursery book will cease, and until then it will be quite time to speak of German chauvinism.

Amidst much mist and darkness there is a bright star in the national character that has not shown itself

of late, for it requires defeat and national humiliation in order to witness its brilliancy. It is German valor and fidelity under defeat. It is one of the fairest attributes of the national character; it is ideal. History is full of it, and well may the nation be proud of its record. Even that rabid chauvinist historian, Thiers,¹ has gone out of his way to bear testimony to the fighting endurance of defeated Germany, and to its fidelity to its unfortunate leaders.

SUMMARY

For ages the characteristic lack of unity and unreadiness for action displayed by the Germans was pointed out both by friend and foe, until the Prussians repeatedly worsted the Austrians, the representatives of this older Teutonic spirit. Through the influence of Prussia the other states are growing in patriotism. At the time of Charles V. Germany was the great world power; Luther had begun the Reformation; but no great German leader appeared in the Thirty Years' War that followed, and the national power waned. The fighting capacity and military fidelity of the Germans are strong national traits, but their absence of national life is mirrored even in the language. The dark period succeeding the time of Napoleon fostered a hope of unity which resulted in the victory of Prussia over Austria and in the coronation of Emperor William.

The nature of German institutions has long obstructed unity; the North is largely Protestant and

¹ "Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire."

aristocratic; the South, Catholic and democratic; as in no other country, Catholics place allegiance to the pope above allegiance to the crown; for party interests, Protestants have sacrificed the state to the Roman Catholic Church. Party narrowness and pettiness, the exaggerated value of the individual, and loyalty to lost causes have also worked strongly against unity. The dispassionate impartiality of judgment of the Germans has been largely responsible for their loss of patriotism, for their respectful attitude toward their opponents and for their lack of chauvinism. One of their fairest national traits is their valor and fidelity under defeat.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. What is true of the lack of unity among the Germans?
2. What qualities of the Prussians made them the successful promoters of German unity?
3. How do they contrast with the Austrians?
4. How has the love of the ideal among the Germans hindered their national growth?
5. What was the position of Germany under Charles V.?
6. Why was the time favorable for building a strong nation, and why was the opportunity lost?
7. How does history testify to the fidelity of the Germans in military life?
8. How was the longing for national unity shown in the years from 1815 to 1848, inclusive?
9. How did Prussia show her power of recuperation after her defeat by Napoleon?
10. How have German institutions made unity difficult?
11. What national traits have also stood in its way?
12. Why are English and Americans apt to underrate the finer qualities of the Germans?

13. What is the military attitude of the Germans toward their enemies?
14. What is chauvinism?
15. Is it a German trait?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Europe in the Nineteenth Century. H. P. Judson.
The Nineteenth Century. Robert Mackenzie.
History of Modern Europe. C. A. Fyffe.
The Historical Development of Modern Europe. C. M. Andrews.
Germany, Present and Past. S. Baring-Gould.

CHAPTER II

INTELLECTUAL LIFE

We classify a range of mountains according to the altitude of its highest peaks.—*Anon.*

I

If we follow the history of intellectual development in England, and its bearing on the material achievements of the English people, we perceive that one of the reasons why they have achieved so much is that they have rarely striven but for what they could grasp. Like Bismarck in this, they have ever taken one thing practically in hand at a time. There is comparatively little dreamy ideality in our race; and, in the higher Grecian sense of the word, of that ceaseless striving after the ideally true and beautiful, next to none. But instead of this, we English have ever possessed the great secret of attaining practical success in what we soberly undertook. The wisdom of common sense, thoroughly consistent with genius, has always been ours in a preëminent degree.

Darwin—perhaps the most typical Englishman of the century—of all others, might have been justified in conjuring up imaginary pictures of the past and evolving ideals for the future; yet he remains satisfied with the positive—not to say negative—results of his

researches, and leaves ideal speculation to others. It has been reserved for the Germans, and notably for Professor Haeckel, of Jena, to speculate where Darwin had been content to glean facts.

Thus German idealism—in this instance revealing itself in materialistic speculation—tells us what we *might* attain, while our want of idealism is perhaps the cause of what we *have* achieved.

But idealism does far more than this. It instinctively bids us feel that knowledge of every kind is power to be used for a high purpose. It embodies the highest aspirations of genius, and is the key to the full understanding of its loftiest flights. It is, strange to say, almost a monopoly of the German race; in fact, the people who are nearest to them, such as the Dutch, notably lack it. It is true, idealism has often spelt failure, and reminded us of Icarus with the waxen wings. And yet the restless striving after an—often unattainable—ideal is at the root of some of the greatest thoughts of the Teutonic muse, of German science, as well as of some of the best manifestations of German character.

In science, the tendency to idealize is perhaps more active than anywhere else. It supplies initiative impulse, the interest of new colors and of knowledge touched with wonder. The spectrum analysis is only one of many illustrations. One of the most amazing inventions of the century—the spectroscope—is the work of two Germans, Bunsen and Kirchhoff.

German idealism places science on so high a pedestal that money-making by its votaries is looked upon

as almost degrading.¹ In practical England, the more money a man of science can make the higher he is esteemed. We are more likely to worship outward success in a thing than the thing itself. Hence, we are more likely to accept charlatans than the Germans, and science lacks with us the true spiritual dignity it possesses in Germany. Faraday—in this a rare exception—held up a tradition which, alas! has had no followers. The simple, even humble, life that eminent men of science often lead in Germany would seem astonishing to us, who are accustomed to see men of science becoming social lions.

II

Though many are of the opinion that the fine arts and belles-lettres in Germany are to-day, with few exceptions, represented by a number of merely talented persons, there can be no doubt of the array of great names in the domains of science.² Here we are met by capacities of the very first rank, and that in almost

¹ Those organs of public opinion both here and abroad which have taken part in a recent controversy, and in so doing have spoken disparagingly of German men of science, have hardly shown a deep insight into their leading characteristics. They are a sensitive body of men, not devoid of pedantry, and one individual is no sufficient measure to judge them by; but when the consensus of their action is taken, it may safely be said to be above suspicion of motive. For, generally speaking, though doubtless exceptions will be found here as elsewhere, Germany's leading scientific men are of a stamp that would not jeopardize the sincerity of their conviction for any worldly advantage whatsoever.

² The following is from the pen of an American authority on the state of science in Germany in the present day: "Three countries divide the scientific world between them—Germany, England, and France. The writings of each bear the stamp of their special character and qualities. Germany to-day is at the head of the scientific world. At the beginning of the century it was France, but German influence is now greater than ever that of France was. The students that used to go to Paris now go to Germany. They come back imbued with German doctrines, and with but one aim, that of propagating and following these doctrines out. Thus they have spread all over the world, and have become accepted by nearly every European country."

every branch. To mention a few names at random: We have already referred to Bunsen and Kirchhoff, who conclusively proved the existence of terrestrial matter in the sun. To Professor Czermak Germany owes the discovery of the laryngoscope. To Professor Helmholtz she is indebted for the ophthalmoscope, which has revolutionized ophthalmic medicine, for many wonderful discoveries relating to the natural laws that govern acoustics, and for his philosophical works. The discoveries of salicylic acid, cocaine, and, latest of all, saccharin, must be credited to German science of to-day. The recent discoveries of Dr. Koch have attracted the scientific interest of the civilized world. The X rays of Professor Röntgen need only be mentioned in order to mark the epoch-making importance of the latest German scientific triumph.

In Professor Virchow Germany has not only one of the most eminent anthropologists of our time, but a physiologist of unique standing. In surgery, the names of Langenbeck, of Berlin; Billroth, of Vienna; Nussbaum, of Munich; Scanzoni, of Würzburg; Esmarch, of Kiel, speak for themselves. In jurisprudence, the names of Professor Windscheidt, of Leipzig; Professor Gneist, now dead, and Dr. von Holtzendorf, of Munich, are of cosmopolitan renown, as may also be said of the two eminent statisticians, Dr. Ernst Engel and Laspeyres. In history, Mommsen is still living to carry on those earnest researches connected with the name of his late compeer and master, Leopold von Ranke. In geology, the names of Professor Zirkel, of Leipzig, and Professor Rosenbusch, of Heidelberg,

are as highly esteemed as that of G. von Richthofen, of Berlin, is in geography. In speculative science and metaphysics, men such as Eduard von Hartmann, who is of the pessimistic school, but with a perhaps unconscious leaning toward Herbert Spencer, and whose influence is largely felt throughout the length and breadth of the Fatherland, and Moritz Carrière, the champion of the so-called realistic ideal school, are more or less representative. With these we must mention the late Professor Paul de Lagarde, a man little heeded while he lived, but who since his death has been largely recognized as one of Germany's most original political thinkers, and Frederick Nietzsche, now hopelessly insane, whose brilliant philosophical writings have attracted the attention of thinkers throughout Europe.

Although it is beyond our purpose to do more than mention a few of the representative men of Germany to-day, there is one reflection we cannot suppress, and that is that almost all the above-mentioned eminent men are serving the state in some public capacity. There is hardly one of Germany's great scientific exponents of speculative thought who is not drawn away from the drudgery of mere money-making and installed in some position most fitted to enable him to spread and propagate the fruits of his genius. Further, it is largely owing to such men that theory has developed into method in Germany, and served the purpose of increasing the practical results of every kind of work in the country.

III

In literature, the greatest works of Lessing, Herder, Goethe, and Schiller show signs of a restless craving to find a higher and nobler channel for expressing their ideas. Literature was to these men a medium of conveying philosophy under pleasant and even playful forms. All had one end in view—to strike a chord of broad common consciousness.

Herder was one of the most egotistically ideal of men in native constitution, yet we see him for years sacrificing his original powers of production to collecting the folk-songs of his own and other nations, because his egotism was subdued by an intellectual German sense of the common interests in life, which should be reflected in song and story.

Lessing, indeed, always protested that he was not a poet, and that people made a mistake in calling him one; that he was merely a poor philosophical critic, seeking the best channel to communicate his ideas, and this he found in the drama. Thus, his "Nathan the Wise" is still the most eloquent appeal in favor of tolerance.

The correspondence between Goethe and Schiller proves how much their individual bent in this respect was at one with the lessons of their greater works; the discipline of a high ideal was to be found in its application in the commonest things. "Wilhelm Meister," in its first aspect, seems the most ideal of books, and yet in its second part it passes into a glorification of ordinary domestic life and duty. Still more surprising is the fact that Faust, after all his dreams and aspi-

rations, has to become a reclainer of land and a road-maker, and in this to find the way of his salvation—contentment and peace.

No men of equal eminence were ever so little pleased with their efforts as Goethe and Schiller, for the picture of something still higher was constantly before them to make them dissatisfied with their attempts and to urge them on to greater efforts. This peculiarity of the German mind impresses us the more when we recall Shakespeare, whose stupendous genius apparently seems to have thrown off its immortal products almost unconsciously.

According to the late Friedrich Bodenstedt, the eminent German poet and translator of Shakespeare, the dramatic poetry of his own country cannot compare in originality with that of England. But German literature can boast of a specialty which, though far from original, is yet unique and of far-reaching importance as a means of culture. We refer to the splendid array of literary men who have devoted their whole life's work to the translation of the masterpieces of foreign literature into German. Their name is legion, and men among them, such as Tieck, the two Schlegels, Voss, and Bodenstedt himself, can be said to have contributed more to the culture of the people by their translations than many well-known writers by their original productions. Even a monarch ranks among their number; for the late King John of Saxony translated Dante into German. No country can compare with Germany in its array of literary talent, which, led by true idealism to open up new channels of literary wealth to the nation, devoted its labor in

unselfish earnestness to the comparatively thankless task of reproduction. Among such we must not forget to mention one who is still living, Otto Gilde-meister, of Bremen, whose translations of Lord Byron and also of several of Shakespeare's works are noted for their excellence.

IV

At the present time other elements and a more cosmopolitan run of public taste have put their stamp on the literary productions of the day. Figuratively speaking, Teuton stomachs have been satiated and German brains wearied by the interminable discursive novel of the first half of the century, dragging its serpentine existence through eight or ten volumes, and have long sought refuge in excellent translations of Walter Scott, Bulwer Lytton, Dickens, and other English writers.

Other branches of literature, too, suffered from heaviness of style when, about the time of the new order of things, a number of bright essay-writers came to the front in Berlin and offered the public a taste of the bright, concise, and yet light style of narrative and essay common in England and France. And the good Berliners, who had long chafed under the bit of cumbersome philosophizing in the name of Schelling and Hegel, welcomed the new departure.

In this direction there can be no doubt that the late Heinrich von Treitschke in the "Prussian Year-Books," Paul Lindau in the "The Present," and many others have not only done good work, but have almost founded a style of literature in which Germany had

hitherto been lamentably deficient. It is in part their doing if we can no longer with justice smile at the unvarying ponderosity of German letters. Of course, such masters of sparkling German prose as Heine, Schopenhauer, Börne, David Strauss, and Johannes Scherr had preceded and influenced the public far more, even by the mere form of their productions. Still the fact remains that the German essay-writers of the last twenty-five years have contributed their share toward a more airy and crisp tone in the light literature of the day.

In the late Gustav Freytag we name the most gifted and sterling of all German writers of fiction of our time. He excelled in the portrayal of German life, not only in the present, but in the past, and that with an unrivaled power and truth of interpretation. Freytag possessed the genius of the true born romancist allied to the conscientious thoroughness of the German professor, without his pedantry. He never lent his pen to pander to the sentiment of the hour, and his writings are appreciated and admired by high and humble alike. Some years ago the late Emperor William conferred on him the highest distinction—the order “*Pour le Mérite*” (for merit), the same order that Thomas Carlyle was proud to accept, although he refused the Grand Cross of the Bath from his own sovereign. Next to Gustav Freytag, Spielhagen perhaps stands highest among German novelists.

Paul Heyse as a poet, a novel-writer, and dramatist occupies a very prominent position in the literary world. A born poet, he strongly inclines toward the sentimental—not to say hyper-sentimental. Starting

as a novelist at an early age, he at once became the favorite of German womankind. His descriptive power is southern in its luxurious richness and dreaminess; but, unfortunately, most of his tales—for he is a storyteller more than a novel-writer (Germans, in their thoroughness, making a great distinction between the two)—show a want of manly ruggedness in conception and execution. That is doubtless the reason his dramatic works only have hitherto had a success really due to his other writings. Some of his lyric poems are remarkable for their beauty of sentiment and diction.

Professor Ebers is another typical figure in literature. His success has been largely due to his appeal to that instinct—so strong in the German character—which loves to idealize the history of the far-removed past. Professor Ebers is an eminent scientific Egyptologist, and his novels, weaving historical matter into the form of narrative romance, have not only found countless readers in Germany, but they have been widely read in English and other translations.

The late Friedrich Bodenstedt was not only a dramatic poet of signal culture and power, but was the author of a somewhat exceptional feat in the history of literature, to which he owes his chief fame. He lived for many years in the East, and besides a fascinating account of life in Asia Minor, entitled "A Thousand and One Days in the East," he published a collection of exquisite lyric poems under the title of "The Songs of Mirza Schaffy." It would lead us too far to dwell on the excellence of this unique volume; suffice it to say that it was published under circumstances which left the impression that the poems were

nothing more than translations of oriental poetry, such as the "Songs of Hafiz" and others. This impression was the more likely to gain ground on account of Bodenstedt's recognized position as a translator of Shakespeare. Such, however, was not the case; the work is entirely original. "The Songs of Mirza Schaffy" have run through more than one hundred editions, and are destined to remain a lasting monument to Bodenstedt's genius.

V

In dramatic literature, although its critics continually rail against the shallow taste of the day (as they have done at all times), Germany possesses a long list of names, which, if hardly in one instance equal to the best dramatic writers of France, are yet far above any single one we could put forward among English living authors.

Ernst von Wildenbruch is a dramatic author of depth and power. In him the German ideal romantic tendency is very strong, but unfortunately (as is so often the case with German writers) his characters lose themselves completely in philosophic concentration at the expense of the action of the play. Arthur Fitger is another writer of great dramatic force and originality. His tragedy "Die Hexe" (The Witch) is a play of classic dimensions, and deals with the religious intolerance of past ages.

Richard Voss, Oscar Blumenthal, L'Arronge, Franz von Schönthan, and Hugo Lubbliner, although scarcely typical enough to call for special notice, are yet origi-

nal and fertile writers of great popularity, and many of their plays have been honored by translation and adaptation.

Baron Gustav von Moser is typically representative of a light and airy dramatic style, unembarrassed by heavy ethical aims, and yet far removed from prurency, the former qualities being at all times rare in German literature. He is entirely original both in his workmanship and in the characters he has drawn. The latter are taken from life, and include almost every type to be met with, from the Prussian martinet general down to the "boots" of a country inn. Not only do his plays enjoy an unprecedented popularity in Germany, but some of them have been even more successful in other countries, and made large fortunes for English and American theater proprietors, notably, "Ultimo" (On Change) and "Der Bibliothekar" (The Private Secretary).

Among more recent dramatists and novel-writers Hermann ~~Mu~~ndermann may be mentioned as enjoying great popularity. Whether, however, his writings are destined to last is a question which time alone can answer. Nor must we omit to cite Dr. Max Nordau, the gifted and versatile writer, whose recent work, "Degeneration," has enjoyed an extraordinary vogue both in England and America.

S/S

VI

In philosophy, we find again the ideal influence present. Especially is this noticeable in the works of Schelling and Hegel, whose endeavor to solve the

dread secrets that surround us was strongly mingled with the desire to find a solution which best accorded with their ideal of the beautiful. But as the human mind seems doomed to failure before these master-problems, so also the philosophy of Hegel and Schelling has but remained as a monument of the inability of idealism alone to solve them. It was reserved for Kant to pin down idealism to the realization of the call of duty. In his own words thus defined: "Duty—wondrous thought that worketh neither by fond insinuation, flattery, nor by any threat, but merely by holding up thy naked law in the soul, and so extorting for thyself always reverence, if not always obedience; before whom all appetites are dumb, however secretly they rebel!"

Since Immanuel Kant spoke his last word, and wedded ideality with the stern duty of ethics, no one has been able to add to it. His dictum of the "categorical imperative," the call of duty on us all to regulate our race toward the unattainable, remains to-day the keynote of German intellectual and ethical life. In fact, it is impossible to study the ethical and intellectual life of Germany without being impressed by the vast influence which the teaching of the Königsberg philosopher still exercises over its best minds, and through them almost unconsciously over the minds of the masses. Even the sublime thoughts of Goethe, and in our day, the speculations which the Germans draw from the researches of Darwin, seem only to have intensified the influence of Kant. It seems as if, in a sea of conflicting speculation, the intellect of the nation

were forced to turn back to that strong, courageous thinker who said in effect:

We are unable to pierce the past, the future is hidden from us, but the categorical imperative call of duty to be performed stares us in the face—the obligation of one and all of us to do our share, and to live up to the highest ethical and æsthetical standard we can formulate, without regard to reward or punishment, and before the worship of every other ideal.

VII

Thus we find the sense of duty meeting us everywhere in Germany in a strength hardly realized by other countries. The narrow-minded selfishness of the individual, the jealousy, the envy of the unit, shrink before the supreme spirit of altruistic virtue embodied in this acceptance of the supremacy of duty.

The late Professor Billroth—a great German surgeon and professor at the Vienna University—was once, years before his decease, given up by the doctors. He called his younger colleagues around him and said:

We doctors mustn't deceive ourselves with regard to an illness. We are familiar with death; I more than you, for I am nearer to it. I asked you to come here in order to say good-by to you. Who knows whether to-morrow I shall be able to do so? I thank you all for your labors; remain faithful to science; devote yourselves to it as hitherto.

This reference to duty—this keynote struck in the supreme moment, with an entire forgetfulness of meaner self—is one that finds an echo through the length and breadth of the Fatherland in the hearts of

its best and noblest sons. It has a familiar sound to us, when we go back to those annals that record the growing greatness of England. Was it not the ever-memorable keynote of Nelson's message at the battle of Trafalgar? It even conveys a lesson to us in these latter days, when many are groping their way to find an ethical standard to live by; for, according to a recent writer, "such knowledge of God as he has vouchsafed to us is revealed to us by our perception of causation and our idea of duty."¹

Yet men like Billroth—and he was a representative type—are not melancholy psalm-singers, who walk through life crushed with the oppressive weight of a dread ordeal ever staring them in the face. Far from it. Billroth in private life was an accomplished musician and painter. And this recalls another striking feature of German intellectual life: its affinity to the spirit of ancient Greece, the people of which were so gifted in beautifying the life they led.

VIII

In politics—that one science that people everywhere take to without a question as to knowledge or fitness—German idealism has counted its saddest failures. Notably was this so when, in the hopeless attempt to evolve a system that would help the Fatherland, it was driven to seek models abroad, and above all, to fall in love with the English methods of parliamentary government! Luckily, the man of the hour

¹ Article entitled "Sins of Belief and Sins of Unbelief," by St. George Mivart, in the *Nineteenth Century*, October, 1888.

put an end to that when he told his countrymen, "No, gentlemen; only with blood and iron shall we get what we are all striving for—a great united Fatherland." In Emperor William and in Bismarck we find, for the first time in Germany, the national tendency to idealize allied to the rugged common sense of action, and the result has been the fulfilment of a national dream that wanted this rare union of qualities to find its realization. It was the ideality of a great aim, nurtured in youth, that nerved the late Emperor William in those weary years of struggle, and enabled him to organize his army and join at last in the popular longing for unity. It was this trait in his character that enabled him to feel the response in the hearts of the nation, and to build up the national edifice.

But while dwelling on the results achieved in the present day, it is but just to refer to that high-mindedness, even among German politicians of the past, that did so much to make what has come to pass possible. In connection with this we wish to translate a letter of General Gneisenau to his king, Frederick William III., in the year 1811:

In my saying this, your Majesty will again hold me guilty of poetry, and I will gladly own the impeachment. For religion, prayer, the love for our sovereign, for our country, are nothing but poetry; no elevation of the heart without the sentiment of poetry.

He who acts according to cool calculation must become a confirmed egotist.

The safety of the throne is based on poetry. How many of us who look up with sadness to the tottering throne might find a happy and peaceful position in modest retirement, some even a life of luxury and ease, if, instead of feeling, he only wished

to calculate. Any master would suit him equally well, but the ties of birth, of devotion, of gratitude, hatred against the foreign invaders, attach him to his old master; for his sake he will live or die, for his sake he resigns his family happiness, for his sake he will sacrifice life and property unto the uncertainty of hope.

This is poetry; yes, even of the truest kind. Under its influence I will endeavor to buoy myself up as long as I live, and I will look upon it as an honor to belong to that enthusiastic band ready to surrender everything in order to regain all for your Majesty. For truly such a resolve must be born of an enthusiasm that scorns every selfish consideration. Many are there who think thus, and, conscious as I am of my incompetence in comparison, I will endeavor to act in their spirit.

Such is an instance of German poetic idealism. To it we owe some of the most sympathetic traits of character in modern German annals. It is notably present in some of the well-known friendships of great men: in the communion of minds, never so free from envy, of Luther and Melancthon, of Scharnhorst and Stein, of Blücher and Gneisenau; in letters, in Goethe and Schiller, the two Schlegels, the two Grimms; and in science, the two Humboldts; in our time, most glorious instance of all, in Emperor William, with his great paladins, Bismarck, Von Roon, and Moltke.

It is this ideal Germany that gained the admiration, the enthusiasm, of Carlyle—the dreaminess of high-souled poetry allied to the moral and nervous strength for action.

IX

If it be permissible to think that the English, by their love of sport, of outdoor exercise and games, by their cultivation of body generally, carry on the physical traditions of ancient Greece, so we may say

the Germans in some measure represent the Greek element in an intellectual as well as in an ethical sense.

An influence, if not directly derived from, yet distinctly akin to that of Greece, is traceable, not only in German thought, in literature, in the cultivation of the fine arts, but also in the general spiritual acceptance of life. It is embodied in the ethical and æsthetic feeling of the people. Even their language has many affinities with that of the Greeks, as is proved by their happy renderings of Homer, the Greek dramatists, etc. But if they offer us these affinities to the countrymen of Plato, the practical lesson of their literature and philosophy—self-renunciation in the delights of the ideal in the one, and Kant's "categorical imperative" in the other—will save them from the fate of the Greeks.

It is this culture—this truly classic sentiment—which is reflected in literature and manifests itself in every walk of German life. It often strikes us as revealing a relationship to an ethical creed of its own. It tends to strengthen those feelings of veneration for the best and highest which are so large a part of every sense of religion—the love of the beautiful of the Greeks allied to the true ethical feeling of Christianity. Its result is the so-called *Gemüthsleben* of the Germans, an untranslatable term which signifies "the life of heart and mind combined." In its manifestation it tells us that whatever individual coarseness of manner and feeling is to be found in the Fatherland—and there is enough of this—there yet dwells a spirit in Germany the possession of which other nations might well envy.

The sentiment of piety which we are accustomed to seek for only within the walls of churches we find present in the every-day life of the nation. That which finds no scope in dogmatic casuistry seeks an outlet in events of public and private life.

The public festivals of the nation have something truly ethical in their character. The celebrations of important national events have a grace and dignity peculiar to themselves; the commemorations of great victories have nothing boastful or vainglorious attached to them.

When war was declared in 1870, the inhabitants of Berlin in their thousands sang patriotic songs and cheered in front of the palace of their king, who came to the historical corner window again and again to acknowledge their greetings. At last one of his officers came out and said to the people, "Children, the king must work with his staff right through the night, and begs you will go home now, so that he may be undisturbed." And as if by magic, the whole vast place was deserted. Then, again, who that had the good fortune to witness in 1871 the triumphal return of the troops could ever forget a scene as impressive as it was free from every element of vaingloriousness and vulgarity? When the old emperor William I. died, and shortly afterward his noble son, were not all, poor and rich alike, admitted to look at them in death once more? And what a lesson their conduct conveyed!

Such incidents are instructive as showing us the instincts of heart and mind of a people. In fact, it is almost necessary for a foreigner to have seen some such great national manifestation of feeling in order

to understand the spirit that dwells beneath the rough outer surface.

Although some of the annual church festivals, such as Easter, Whitsuntide, Christmas, no longer appeal in their ecclesiastical character to the masses as of old, yet they are kept, either in the form of a family festival, such as Christmas, or in the open air in their relationship to the reawakening of nature, as in the case of Easter and Whitsuntide. On these two great festivals the people swarm out into the green fields, not to drink and run riot, but instinctively to worship God in the contemplation of His works, so beautifully described by Goethe in the first part of "Faust." The Germans are lovers of nature in a sense that is perhaps only met with among the Japanese, who have special festivals all the year round whenever certain flowers are in blossom—the cherry, the plum, the iris, the chrysanthemum, and the sacred lotus: it is part of their religion.

In the care the Germans bestow on the graves of their dead, and in their affectionate reverence, they stand preëminent, as is evidenced by the beautiful monuments erected all over the Fatherland in memory of their brethren fallen in battle. He who could gaze on the monument on the Niederwald in commemoration of 1870-71 without feeling a thrill of piety can possess little *Gemüth*, little sense of the ideal, no matter to what nation he belongs. The German words for cemetery—*Friedhof* (the court of peace), *Gottesacker* (God's acre)—breathe an ideal sentiment peculiar to the German nation. Even in familiarly speaking of the dead, the German word *selig* (resting in God) has

a peculiar charm of its own. In this, as in many other ways, the Germans remind us of the ancient Greeks.

That eminent Scotch thinker, Fletcher of Saltoun, once said, "If I may make the songs of a people, let who will make the laws." And no wonder, for it is far easier to promulgate fifty laws than to make one song which shall reach the heart of the people and reflect its best aspirations. The best instincts of the German people are embodied in their songs. Their ideality, their patriotism, their love of the beautiful, their intense love of nature, and even indirectly their very history, all are reflected in their *Volkslieder*—the harmonious blending of poetry and song. A *Volkslied*, as distinct from an evanescent popular ditty, is not *made* in the ordinary meaning of the word; it is created; its origin is divine. It is divine in the sense that it owes its origin to that supernatural instinct in us which belies our meaner nature, and bids us feel that there is something higher, something spiritual, in store for us.

X

Germany is the country of the inimitable *Volkslied*, the home of musicians and composers, and yet it was a celebrated German author, Karl Gutzkow, who wrote thus:

In fact, what is music to us, these mathematics of sound? In great musicians I have always found people who, although conversant with keys, can solve nothing for us. If listening to music influences me to believe in the immortality of the soul, it may influence others at the same time to take an opposite

view. No; music will cease to belong to the highest arts. Does it not already in the opera approach more and more to mere declamation?

The following sentences of Hermann Presber, the novel-writer, are even more scathing:

Sound [*der Ton*] is the vibrating soul. But vibrating souls are mostly devoid of intellect. Music is the only art in which, side by side with talent, stupidity gets on cheerfully, and may even assert itself with arrogance. Yes, yes! Music is the most social and sociable of the arts. It is only a question who is able to feel at home long in purely musical society. Only give an individual the high C and the low C, and he, like Philip of Macedon's gold-laden ass, will soon penetrate every town and every boudoir.

These are strange words to us who are accustomed to believe that a want of the appreciation of music betokens a want of heart. But in some things we are childlike enthusiasts compared to the Germans, particularly as critics. For they, even when carried away, are too likely to stop and inquire into the psychical causes of their emotion.

Thus, not against music itself, but against the excess of its cultivation, to the exclusion of more important matters, many sober thinkers in Germany¹ have been raising their voices of late. They are of opinion that, excellent as the influence of music undoubtedly is in itself, its excess is often injurious, and is indulged in at the expense of the development of reading, sound thinking, and, above all, of high-mindedness.

They know by daily experience that a man may be an excellent musician, and yet in every other particu-

¹ In France similar expressions of opinion are to be found, viz., "*Contre la Musique*" (Against Music), by Victor de Laprade (1881).

lar a fool. More than that, they see that the kingdom of Saxony, the home of music preëminently, is also the headquarters of the German Philistines and of their dread specter, social democracy. In Austria the music-gifted Bohemians are on a very low level of morality and education; and in Vienna, where Beethoven and Schubert lived and died, the cultivation of music has not, according to all accounts, increased the logical powers or the moral perceptions of its good inhabitants.

Music is of all arts the one that appeals most exclusively to the senses, and, except in the case of its higher walks, it can scarcely be said to be to the ethical advantage of the community. Its excess is distinctly baneful to the mental development of a nation. In Hungary, for instance, the cultivation of music goes hand in hand with the idleness for which that pleasure-loving people are noted. Thus it is not surprising to find that great and petty despots have ever encouraged music, for it prevented their subjects from thinking seriously. Music has always been the favorite art of oppressed nationalities. It may be a civilizing element—a tamer of the savage breast—in a low order of things; but it is often cultivated in an advanced community to the neglect of more important matters.

The record of the lives of great musicians shows a strange medley of eccentricity and of the dominant effects of an undue excitability of the nervous system. Also, great composers, with few exceptions, are remarkably short-lived. Liszt, Verdi, and Rossini are the exceptions among a list that includes such instances of short-lived men as Mozart, Schubert, Weber,

Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, Chopin, and even Schumann, whose life was one constant misery of nervous depression.

In Germany to-day musicians are more or less a class by themselves, and a very peculiar, irritable type they often represent. For if even creative musical genius shows a sad record of mental peculiarity, it is not surprising that mere executants are remarkable for many petty manifestations of an ill-balanced nervous system.

XI

Germany is now suffering from a plethora of music and musicians,¹ and yet one of its noblest specialties, the oratorio,² and one of the most complete musical instruments, the organ, are much less cultivated than in England. Against that, however, may well be put the beautiful church music of the Catholics and the impressive vocal chorals of Protestant churches. The *Volkslied* also—that unique manifestation of the national love for poetry and music combined, to which reference has already been made—may be classed as one of the highest and most precious forms of music in Germany.

Next to these forms of music which touch the chord of national life must be mentioned the splendid and cheap orchestral concerts, of violin quartettes, male chorus unions, for their excellence and wide diffusion are beyond comparison with those of any other coun-

¹ Although those instruments of torture, street bands and organs, are fortunately prohibited.

² Germany does not possess any musical institutions like the Handel Choir, the Bristol Musical Festival Society, or those of Worcester and Birmingham.

try. Also, the operas of Richard Wagner have become distinctly national, and as such may well be said to belong fittingly to the period of national reawakening in our time. They strike a strong patriotic Teutonic key, and thus their continued performance at Bayreuth is wisely encouraged by the emperor. Wagner's standard operas fill the theaters from stalls to gallery all over the country wherever operatic music is heard.

It is not these noble forms of music themselves that pique the critical pessimist—they are a precious heirloom of national genius; it is the over-addiction of the masses to fritter away their time and to dull their energies for thought in running after every form of music, and also the dreadful mania for pianoforte-playing which exists in Germany. It has been well pointed out that the pleasure-loving south of Germany (including Austria) has produced its great musicians, whereas the north must be credited with its thinkers.¹ The piano-playing mania, however, extends from the North Sea down to the Alps; it is universal and omnipresent. In Weimar it is forbidden to play the piano with the window open, under a penalty of two marks.² And this is no wonder, for in German towns every floor of a house harbors at least one family and at least one piano, not to mention stringed instruments of torture.

The excellent German musical academies (*Musik-conservatorien*) were originally designed to train musicians for the orchestra, piano-playing being looked

¹ It is strange to note the great number of hard thinkers that hail from the northeast of Prussia—Im. Kant and Schopenhauer, also Copernicus and Kepler; whereas Germany's greatest poets, except Heine, almost all hail from the south. Schiller, Goethe, Uhland, Victor von Scheffel, were born in the south of Germany.

² About fifty cents in United States currency.

upon as a secondary branch of the musical profession. This intention has been partly frustrated of late, as we find on comparing the numbers of students of the piano with those of other instruments. Thus at the academy in Vienna in the year 1880 there were four hundred pupils in piano-playing, and of these three hundred and fifty were girls. It is this advent of women that has particularly contributed to the present craze of piano-playing. It has conquered the profession of music in Germany, as in England novel-writing has come to assert its sway.

Yet even in music, the art in which the mind leans over to unattainable sentiment and lends expression to the emotions in greater measure than to the intellectual faculties, we have but to glance at the prose writings of Robert Schumann and Richard Wagner in order to note dissatisfaction with the whole method of musical expression and aim of the time. We observe that restless and yet ideal striving for something higher, something truer, as the motive power that nerved the efforts of these two monarchs of the realms of sound. Wagner's theater at Bayreuth, built expressly for the performance of his musical dramas, was the last and outward embodiment of an instinct that led him to seek the most congenial forms in the models of ancient Greece. His genius ransacked the folk-lore of Scandinavia, the history and the myths of the Middle Ages, only to find its last spiritual expression in the legends of early Christianity, "Parsifal."

The great past supplies us with a splendid record of German ideal striving in music. From Bach's Passion music to Handel's oratorios, the idealization of

Christianity is the golden thread that runs through German music.

Nor ought we in fairness to omit a short reference to the distinction Germany has attained in the sister arts of architecture and painting. Are not the cathedrals of Strassburg and Cologne mighty testimonies to the boldness of thought and conception of Germany's imperial past? Who but can recall the name of a Holbein, an Albrecht Dürer? In the first half of this century, as if fitly to herald in the great events still slumbering in the womb of time, we note Peter Cornelius at work on his colossal frescoes illustrating the mythological past of Germany; Wilhelm von Kaulbach, also a fresco-painter, proclaiming the "Triumph of the Reformation"; Adolf Menzel's pencil busy with the congenial task of bringing Frederick the Great and his paladins back to life again; and, last but not least, artistic genius in Franz von Lenbach to hand down to posterity the speaking portraits of the great men who collaborated in the unification of Germany.

SUMMARY

A striving after the ideal is the root of the greatest thoughts of German poetry, science, and manifestation of character. In almost every branch of science Germany takes the lead. Nearly all of her most eminent scientists are serving the state in some public capacity, thus giving them opportunity for the full development of their genius. In literature, writers have aimed primarily to express their philosophy; Lessing calls himself not a poet, but a poor philosopher. Germany

is eminent in translators; essays, modeled after the English, have become popular. Among the best novelists ranks the versatile Gustav Freytag; Professor Ebers has gained a world-wide fame through his historical novels; Friedrich Bodenstedt is justly noted for his fiction and his translations. Baron Gustav von Moser is perhaps the best representative of the contemporary dramatist. Kant gave idealism its "call to duty"—the keynote of the national intellectual and ethical life. In politics, idealism was impotent, until Emperor William and Bismarck allied it to the rugged common sense of action.

Classical culture, "the life of heart and mind combined," is everywhere manifested. The German depth of feeling finds expression in the great national celebrations and church festivals, in reverence for the dead, in an harmonious blending of poetry and song. Yet the Germans have strongly protested against excessive indulgence in music as weakening character. Germany is preëminent in her church music and her folk-song; Wagner's operas have become distinctly national. German music, architecture, and painting all show this same yearning for the ideal.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. How does English "practicality" compare with German idealism?
2. Illustrate this in the attitude of the two countries toward men of science.
3. Who are some of the leading German scientists, and for what are they famous?
4. How does the state further the work of these men?

5. How is German idealism illustrated in the work of Goethe, Schiller, and Lessing?
6. What eminent men have translated foreign masterpieces into the German tongue?
7. What has been the influence of essay-writers in Germany in recent years?
8. For what work is Gustav Freytag distinguished?
9. Describe briefly the work of Heyse, Ebers, and Bodensiedt.
10. Who are the leading German dramatists of the present day?
11. What is meant by Kant's "categorical imperative"?
12. How has his influence been felt in Germany?
13. How is idealism illustrated in the lives of some of the greatest Germans?
14. How does German literature and life suggest that of ancient Greece?
15. Give illustrations of the strong ethical spirit which pervades the German people?
16. What dangers do German critics fear from the excessive tendency to cultivate music?
17. What results can be shown on the higher side of the cultivation of the fine arts?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Histories of German Literature. W. Scherer, Bayard Taylor, and James K. Hosmer.
- Hours with German Classics. F. H. Hedge.
- Classic German Course in English. Wilkinson.
- Essays on German Literature. Boyesen. (Goethe, Schiller, the German Novel, the Romantic School in Germany.)
- Modern German Literature. Benjamin W. Wells.
- Richard Wagner and His Works. Henry T. Finck.
- Studies in the Wagnerian Drama. H. E. Krehbiel.
- German, Flemish, and Dutch Painting. Buxton and Poynter.

CHAPTER . III

EDUCATIONAL

Now 'tis the spring, and weeds are shallow rooted ;
Suffer them now, and they'll o'ergrow the garden,
And choke the herbs for want of husbandry.

—*Shakespeare.*

I

If the schools are the cradle, the universities are the training-ground of intellectual life, in Germany more even than elsewhere. There the national ideals have slumbered on through times of devastating war and misery, in order to awake to new life with the returning sunshine of peace.

The German universities have at all times cherished the idea of national unity, and have kept it alive when it had been lost sight of almost everywhere else. In fact, they have supplied the impulse that has kept the current of patriotism healthily circulating when without them stagnation and indifference might have prevailed. This great fact must be borne in mind as an offset against some of the sad political pedantry of German professors.

Thus Bismarck's partiality for the universities was only natural; when, on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, deputations from nineteen universities greeted him with enthusiasm, he replied, "I will gladly

die, now that I see this flower of youth before me." And ten years later, when he celebrated his eightieth birthday, or, to be more correct, when the whole of Germany, except a majority of the Reichstag, joined in the celebration of his birthday at Friedrichsruh, it was the deputations from every university and high school throughout Germany—over five thousand strong, with their rectors at their head—which lent most impressiveness to the national character of the scene.

The realization of the German Empire has given an extraordinary impulse to university life, and to-day it can be said with more truth than ever that Germany is the classic land of universities. Elsewhere may be found special schools and academies which present exceptional features of excellence, but nowhere can universities be found similar to hers. There are twenty-two universities in the German Empire, of which eleven fall to Prussia proper. These twenty-two universities are so many active centers of knowledge, and include a staff of two thousand professors and over thirty thousand students.

The following remarks on the spirit that pervades the German universities of to-day, made by a French Catholic priest who studied at Leipzig in 1882, seem to carry more weight than anything we could say, as they are those of a witness not likely to be biased in their favor.¹

In order to become acquainted with the soul [*l'âme—der Geist*] of Germany it is necessary to see that community in its daily life—that is, attracted to the university—from every class of the nation. Here they meet in absolute fraternal equality.

¹ "Les Allemands" (The Germans), by Le Père Didon. Paris, 1884.

The common devotion to knowledge, without destroying the distinction of birth and fortune, yet creates above them a higher unity, where the most intelligent and laborious take the first place.

Then again:

It is only possible to understand the high civilizing power of the universities in Germany when we have gained a full picture of the curriculum of instruction followed out there.

The course of instruction embraces the universality of science; it extends to the limits of human knowledge. . . . Theology and philosophy, metaphysics and the positive sciences, their systems and their facts, doctrine and history, literature and languages, everything is included in its essentially encyclopædic domain. More than that, certain arts, the exercise of which presupposes talent of a high order, such as painting, sculpture, architecture, music, the science of agriculture, the art of war, are all comprised in this limitless domain of superior instruction. In truth, this world in itself contains everything that is necessary to cultivate the human brain.

It must be frankly admitted that among no people in the world, even among the most intelligent and best educated, is the universality of knowledge cultivated as in Germany. . . . Nowhere do universities so thoroughly justify their tradition of centuries, their great name of Alma Mater. . . . In examining the intellectual life of Germany, the twenty-two universities of the empire appear as the culminating points of its scientific organization. These twenty-two summits form, in the region of intellect, the high chain of mountains which govern the plain from afar, and from whose heights the supply of modern thought and knowledge runs like limpid crystal through endless channels to within the reach of all.

II

But every result must be purchased, and just as we see the culture of music leading to its excess, so the price Germany pays for its extended university system

may be said to consist in an annually increasing contingent of intellectual proletariat¹ to be found in the country. This increase is even attracting the notice of German public opinion. Lawyers without practice, doctors without patients, men of science without pupils—all these elements find no scope in practical life, and go to swell the army of poverty and blighted hopes.

What Germany owes to her splendid system of school education is so well known that it may seem superfluous to recapitulate it here. On the other hand, it may be useful to point to a few peculiarities of the system, if only to guard us against blindly accepting it as a model, as we seem at times too much inclined to do.

Amidst all the nebulous theories of speculative philosophy that raise the smile of foreigners, it remains a fact that the German people have carried more philosophy into every-day life than any other nation. Unconsciously, the categorical imperative of Kant, "Duty," forms the basis of Germany's intellectual character and action. For if we at most produce *individuals* above the vulgar race for wealth, the Germans produce *whole classes* whose aims are entirely distinct from money-making, and the most prominent class is that of the German schoolmaster.

It is true that before 1866 the English type of the speculative schoolmaster had sprung up in Germany, but the rigid Prussian educational test requirements for military service soon put an end to amateur educationalism as a means of making a fortune. Whereas

¹ This term is applied on the Continent to the lower working classes.

English schoolmasters are nothing if not speculative money-makers, the German teacher is as poor as a church mouse, but devoted to his work heart and soul. It is impossible to find his equal elsewhere in the world.

But the opinion is gradually gaining ground that he is grinding the youth of the country to powder, and that it is time to put the brake on. The very high school qualifications required to pass the examination for the one-year service in the army are drilled into the boys at so early an age as to put almost too great a strain on their physical system. These tests have become more severe of late, as well as the complicated examinations that have to be passed in order to obtain any civil or military appointment later on.

But we are chiefly concerned with the enormous strain put on boys during their younger years, and of this it may be said that it is so excessive as, in many instances, to affect them physically and stunt their growth intellectually. A German paper says:

The overburdening of our youth with school-work is again the subject of wide discussion with our pedagogues, as well as with those other philanthropists who are anxious for the welfare of our youth. We have collected a few opinions of authorities on the subject, which we append:

"Our monopolized gymnasium,¹ with its devotion to the dead languages and their grammar, has brought us to such a pass that we—the so-called best educated classes—are strangers in our own century, unable to free ourselves from a dead and abstract world amidst which we have passed our youth in order to obtain certain examinatory qualifications. It

¹ The German term for schools in which the usual classical curriculum is followed.

is questionable whether we are ever able to free ourselves from the consequences, let alone the bodily and ethical damage done to us by this enforced torture. HARTWIG.¹

"DUSSELDORF, *May*, 1886.

"We seem to have forgotten too readily that the word *gymnasium* originally means a place set apart for athletic exercise. LOTHAR BUCHER.²

"BERLIN, *May*, 1886.

"Schools ought to be fitted to the requirements of humanity.

"VIENNA, *June*, 1886. OPPOLZER.

"The gymnasium with its two dead languages cannot last; the only alternative is to drop either Greek or Latin.

"EDUARD V. HARTMANN.³

"GR. LICHTERFELDE, *May*, 1886.

"I accuse our schools of unfair competition, for they only bring out two-legged encyclopædias.

"*July* 13, 1886. HERMANN J. MEYER.⁴

"True culture does not consist of dead knowledge and hollow tests of memory, but in the true development of the heart and of the reasoning faculties of the brain.

"JENA, *June*, 1886. ERNST HAECKEL.⁵

"An excess of heterogeneous knowledge weakens our senses and lames our will. WILLIAM JORDAN.⁶

"FRANKFORT-ON-THE-MAIN, *July*, 1886.

"Those who look after the condition of light and fresh air in our schools, when they see that the number of diseased eyes and lungs does not decline, forget that in numberless cases the bad air and bad light at home in the evenings undo all the

¹ A well-known German philologist.

² Privy Councilor Lothar Bucher, until lately Bismarck's right-hand man in the Foreign Office.

³ The best known of living German philosophers.

⁴ Compiler of the best known German encyclopædia.

⁵ Professor of natural sciences at Jena; well-known Darwinian.

⁶ Philologist and poet of reputation.

good of light, airy schoolrooms. Therefore, reduce the amount of work to be done at home in the evening. There it is. Teach in school, but give youth its freedom at home.

"BERLIN, May 28, 1886.

J. REULEAUX."¹

It is, however, only fair to add that a number of professors of the University of Heidelberg have recently signed a declaration to the effect that they do not believe in the evil consequences of the present system of school education. Yet there can be no doubt that one of its outcomes is a large amount of so-called *Halbbildung* (half-education), which carries imperfectly digested theories into the community and tends to swell the ranks of Social Democrats.

Besides, a large amount of this burdensome school knowledge is utterly lost and thrown away in after-life by those who have been forced to attain it in order to pass the one-year-service examination for the army—and the ambition to do so is found down to the humblest walks of life. Then again, the leaning toward intellectual knowledge too often dies away in the practical battle of life, and thus we find a great amount of stunted intellect in the country among those who have not been able to realize the promise of their school-days.

One definite omission we are convinced they ought to supply, and this is a greater study of political economy and of political science. These are the things which, percolating the masses through the younger generations, will do more than the newspapers to form the judgment of the people and produce a well-balanced popular opinion.

¹ Privy councillor and member of the Prussian Chamber of Commerce.

III

There are other points which call for remark. In the strain of over-study the cultivation of character is neglected. The masters are so engrossed with the intellectual progress of their pupils that they have little attention to bestow on the development of their character, a point far better attended to even in "good-for-nothing-else" English schools. The German masters are excellent instructors (*Lehrer*), but rarely educators (*Erzieher*). One of the causes of this is that the German boys do not pass so much of their free time—of which they have very little—in the company of the master, as in England. If English boys spend too much of their time in play, the German boys spend too little.¹ And this is to be deplored for two reasons: the first is that outdoor games are so necessary for the bodily health and development of youth; the second, that it is principally by companionship and joining in the games of their pupils that English schoolmasters are able to exercise a healthy influence on the character of their charges.

The German schoolmasters prematurely develop the brain at the expense of the physique, and without enough attention to the character; the English pedagogues develop the character and the physique to the neglect of the brain. A comparison of the outward appearance of a class of English and German schoolboys, say between the ages of twelve and fifteen, will at once impress an observer, and would prove the best

¹ This is undergoing a change for the better of late; not only in schools, but among the population at large, outdoor recreative exercise is on the increase.

answer to the recent declaration of the Heidelberg professors. The English boys look far healthier and more active than their German brothers, and their manners are much more easy and engaging.

Further, we have no hesitation in saying that, admitting that the schoolroom knowledge of a German youth of twenty is, on an average, far above that of the English lad of the same age, it is by no means certain that the same holds good when they are both forty or fifty. On the contrary, from our observation we should say that as they grow older the intellectual attainments of the two tend to equalize, and when they come to the prime of life, the Englishman, whose life is generally more active and practical, is quite on a par in intellectual power with the better educated German. And from fifty upwards we are even inclined to think the German goes stale sooner than the Englishman. And if such be the case, it must be owing to the fact that the English on an average lead a more healthy life, for where the Germans do lead a healthy outdoor life we see the remarkable vitality of their military commanders. German education forces too much at too early an age, often affecting the elasticity of the brain in after years, unless it is compensated by the healthiness of later life, as in the army.

Besides those already noted, there are other distinct contrasts between English and German school systems. The English master devotes all his attention to the most gifted and diligent boys, neglecting the less intelligent ones, for it is important for him to become known through the success of his pupils at

examinations in order to secure further patronage. German masters devote themselves equally to the instruction of all, without money interest, and also without holding forth prizes as an incentive. Prizes and scholarships are almost unknown in German schools as well as in university life.

As German boys play hardly any outdoor games, compared with English boys, so also those friendships among themselves, which in England so often last through after-life, are comparatively rare. As stated above, the system does not tend to bring out the character, but, on the contrary, rather to subdue and suppress the natural effervescence of youth. At the same time, it must not be forgotten that what the school omits the university makes amends for. The German university has a most powerful influence in developing the character of the student for good, as also sometimes for evil. It is there that the sentiment of honor is most rigorously instilled; and although we must deplore the excrescences which show themselves in undue sensitiveness and quarrelsomeness, in the brutality of dueling—the foundation of it all—the care for the honest dignity of character which we find exemplified in the best German is still a priceless possession of German manhood. It is also at the university that the German youth imbibes his idealism, it is there that he often forms his most lasting friendships. One cause of vitiating character in England, *the* one English school and university vice, is as yet comparatively unknown in Germany—viz., toadyism, inculcated by English parents themselves in sending their boys to school, and later on to the university,

merely to pick up connections to help them to get on socially in after-life.

In conclusion, it is interesting to emphasize that prizes and scholarships being unknown both at German schools and universities, the astonishing results of German education are gained without appealing to the instincts of rivalry or competition—a most instructive fact. The sense of duty attains here single-handed a result which with us has to be brought about by rivalry and the hope of reward.

SUMMARY

The German universities have been the conservators of ideals, especially of the ideal of national unity. Bismarck frequently showed that he thoroughly realized their force. Within recent years they have grown in number and excellence, so that to-day they outrank those of every other country. An unfortunate result of this higher education, however, is to be found in the large number of ill-paid scholarly men. The schoolmasters are largely superior to money considerations and devoted to their work. Whether the school system demands too much of the student is a debatable question; the weight of authority seems to show that it does. The German teacher frequently neglects the body for the brain; the English, the brain for the body. Unlike the English teacher, the German devotes himself equally to all his pupils. Lasting friendships, though more common in the universities, are rarely formed at the schools. The system of prizes and scholarships so prevalent in England is unknown in German universities.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. How have the German universities influenced the national life?
2. What can be said of the numbers and general influence of these institutions?
3. What distinction applies to German schoolmasters as a class?
4. What serious defects have been noted in the present school system?
5. What comparison is drawn between English and German schoolboys?
6. How does the university help to remedy some of the defects of the school system?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Germany, Present and Past. S. Baring-Gould.

CHAPTER IV

THE PRUSSIAN MONARCHY

The Sovereign is the Sovereign of all. The proper leader of the people is the individual who sits on the throne.—*Lord Beaconsfield.*

I

Englishmen who have gained their liberties by centuries of struggle against the pretensions of the crown are loath to admit the advantages of a strong monarchy, even if they are not instinctively suspicious of it. Yet who can say, supposing that, instead of the Stuarts, they had been ruled by a royal house of the stamp of the Hohenzollerns—who can say that the monarchy might not be as powerful in England to-day as we have seen it to be in Prussia?

If an elective monarchy of old made possible the Thirty Years' War, which brought Germany from its position of the first power of Europe down to a waste desert inhabited by hardly five millions of half-starving human beings, on the other hand the stability of the House of Hohenzollern has proved the salvation of Germany in our time. What the English would deem a curse for themselves has turned out a blessing for Germany, and what they would have thought likely to benefit the Germans—namely, their own parliamentary institutions—would in all probability have proved powerless to help them.

From the first burgrave of Nuremberg, who bought the margravate of Brandenburg from the impecunious Holy Roman Emperor Sigismund, down to the Prussian rulers of our day, the family of Hohenzollern supplies us with a series of extraordinary instances of the descent of certain qualities from father to son.

Of Suabian origin—and Suabia is the traditional home of caninness and thrift—the Hohenzollerns have almost all been distinguished by the possession of these useful qualities, allied to strong common sense which prevented them from turning to diseased niggardliness. On the contrary, the characteristics of the Suabian family only seem to have hardened in a northern soil until they burst forth in the full effulgence of genius in Frederick the Great. By a strange freak of fortune, even the one Hohenzollern of a long line of rulers who formed an exception to the family characteristic of closeness in money matters benefited his country by his extravagant vanity. For he it was—Frederick I.—who, again profiting by the impecuniousness of the Emperor Leopold, gained the title of King of Prussia, if he did not even use a little bribery in the affair, and thus attained that recognition for his country of which his successors took such great advantage. Yet even in this particular the Hohenzollerns show to advantage compared with other German sovereigns, almost all of whom owe their present titles to having sided with the French against their own countrymen. Thus we have in this extraordinary family hardly a single ruler who did not in one way or another add his mite to the foundation of Prussian power.

II

To understand the position of the Hohenzollerns of to-day it is necessary to look at the past, and, before referring to their doings, just cast a glance at the negative merit of what they refrained from doing. Allowing for the times they lived in, it will be found that, man for man, from the days of the Great Elector¹ down to our own time, they have been individually far superior to their compeers on the German thrones.

Whereas the successive rulers of the one German state which might at one time have made itself the head of Protestant Germany—Saxony—had missed their political opportunities, King Frederick William I. was quietly drilling his soldiers, filling the national coffers, and organizing a model administration in every department of the state. The amiable Guelphs, just called to rule over the English, were indulging their favorite tastes, cursing the English, making themselves hated, and thus consolidating the power of the English aristocracy. At that very time the Duke of Würtemberg was ruining his country by an extravagant imitation of French court life and immorality. Later on, when Frederick the Great was consolidating the fruits of his victories, the landgrave of Hesse-Cassel was amassing a private fortune of forty million dollars by selling his subjects to England to be employed in coercing the American colonists. But the coarse vagaries of the Guelphs in Hanover, the splendid extravagances of the courts of Würtemberg,

¹ Frederick William (1640-1688), the founder of the Prussian state.

Bavaria, Hesse, and Saxony, are only interesting as they enable us to see how the Hohenzollerns managed to wade through the rottenness of the times and remain, on the whole, unsoiled. For their record, side by side with such, is a comparatively clean one.

But freedom from rascality is only an indication of a superiority the Hohenzollerns invariably possessed and showed by their actions. They have proved true to the motto of the greatest of them all, that the king is the first servant of the state. They have ever set their ambition to work out the development and welfare of the entire nation instead of that of a class. The humblest have felt it to be so, as is proved by the celebrated answer of the miller to Frederick the Great, who, when the king threatened to expropriate him unjustly, replied, "There are still judges in Berlin, your Majesty!" Can we imagine a French miller threatening Louis XV. with a judge?

To be a monarch of the poor is even to-day the boast of the Hohenzollerns. Against the pretensions of the aristocracy they have always sided with the rising citizen class, however strongly personal ties may have bound them to the nobility. Whenever the vital interests of the people have been at stake, the Prussian monarchs have seen that justice was done. And it is perhaps indirectly owing to this distinction that the Prussians and their rulers have always been most cordially hated by certain elements in politics. Those of doubtful moral standing in particular have ever been fiercest in their dislike to Prussia. In our time the Prussians have known no greater enemies than those morganatic ladies who infest the little courts of Ger-

many, and who have wielded considerable political influence from time to time.

In the beginning of the last century, the Hohenzollerns introduced obligatory education, amidst the derision of foreigners, and gradually abolished mediæval serfdom. So also in our day we see them breaking entirely new and hitherto untrodden ground, introducing economic measures for the welfare of the masses.

It has ever been their supreme merit to recognize that a nation does not consist of a small minority of privileged persons, but rather that the meanest and the humblest have an equal claim on the care and solicitude of the sovereign. In this traditional and truly royal acceptance of the duties of a monarch lies the secret of the sovereign's power in Prussia. This it is that has enabled Prussia from time to time to bear the strain put upon the very existence of the state, and to face a world in arms.

From the first the Hohenzollerns have been the nurturers and educators of their people. It is they who have impressed their administration with that stamp of incorruptible rectitude, that iron sense of duty and care for the welfare of all classes of the community, so that one and all are ready to recognize these qualities, now that they have been brought to the attention of the world by military success. But long ago there were observers who needed not military success to quicken their perceptions, and one of them was the late Lord Lytton, who in 1840 declared that Prussia was the best governed country in the world.

III

About the same time that Charles II. was in receipt of a yearly bribe from Louis XIV. through the hands of a French courtesan, the Great Elector of Brandenburg, the victor of Fehrbellin, was offering shelter to the French Protestants whom the revocation of the Edict of Nantes had driven from their homes. He it was who, after the Thirty Years' War, finding his country swarming with titled do-nothings, put a firm if despotic stop to gambling and profligacy, and gathered the scions of the poor nobility to the standards of his victorious army. Such despotism has now and then done good service in history, and in this instance it laid the foundation of that devotion of the poor Prussian aristocracy to the throne and the army which has borne such splendid fruit in our time.

Frederick William I. found his kingdom not only impoverished by the extravagance of his predecessor, but still showing the traces of the devastation of a previous century of warfare. Whole districts were still untilled waste, and even as late as the eighteenth century the pest had fearfully devastated East Prussia. It was the king himself who by proclamations and patents attracted foreigners from Saxony and Würtemberg, from the Palatinate, from Switzerland and Bohemia, and, together with the Protestants who were driven from Austria, turned them into industrious and contented citizens. He cut canals, laid out highroads, caused heather land to be furrowed by the plow. He extended the postal system. Model farms and cattle-breeding establishments were fostered and encouraged,

and the celebrated stud of Trakehnen, which was destined to improve the breed of horses all over the country, owed its existence to the solicitude of the king.

Frederick William was far more a king of the poor than a "soldier king," as one-sided historians long declared him; the hardness and harshness for which he has been blamed were often necessary in his work of reform. The landed aristocracy rebelled when he sought to abolish the serfdom of the peasantry, and he only succeeded in diminishing the unjust exactions of the landowners. When the petty nobility refused to pay a land-tax, and demanded that their grievance should be put before the Provincial Diet, he wrote the memorable words: "I shall gain my point, and plant the sovereignty of the crown as firm as a rock of bronze, and let these gentry indulge in their windy talk in the Diet. We can afford to let people talk when we gain our point." Compulsory education, the official system, and universal military service, which he introduced, have since become part of the flesh and blood of the nation.

IV

It was Frederick the Great who, in the midst of the dogmatic and philosophic contentions of the time, quietly said: "In my country everybody can secure his salvation in his own fashion." To him it was that one of his great territorial nobles, Count Schaffgotsch, wrote apologizing for having changed his religion. He explained how the acquisition of the estate of Schlackenwerth was bound up with the condition of

his becoming a Catholic. Frederick, in his reply, dryly put it: "I have taken cognizance of your lordship's action, to which I have no objection. Many roads lead to heaven; your lordship has struck out on the road by Schlackenwerth. *Bon voyage!*"

In every department of political and social reform Frederick the Great took the initiative. He continued his father's work of creating a free and independent peasant class, particularly through his edict of 1764, which led the way to the total abolition of peasant serfdom. He advanced capital to the peasant soil-cultivator, saw that whole districts were drained, laid the foundations of new villages, and gained arid tracts of land for the plow.

The reign of Frederick William III. was one of deep national misfortune and degradation. Still, the personal qualities of the king command our highest respect. At a time when the pretensions of the aristocracy, particularly in the army, were an unbearable nuisance, the king promulgated the following cabinet order:

I have noticed with great displeasure that young officers in particular endeavor to take precedence of civilians. I shall see that the army is duly esteemed and recognized in its proper place at the seat of war, where it is called upon to risk life and limb in the defense of the country. Otherwise, no soldier, whatever his rank, is to dare to ill-treat even the humblest of my citizens, for it is they, and not I, who keep the army. In their service are the soldiers the command of whom is confided to me, and arrest, dismissal, and even the penalty of death await those who act in contravention to my orders.

This is in the true Hohenzollern spirit of protecting the weak from the strong, and explains the attachment of

the people to the king notwithstanding the trials Prussia underwent during his reign.

In his reign, too, domestic virtue, so sadly outraged by society at the time, gained a shining example in his own family. The divine figure of Queen Louisa stands out for all time as a model of a royal wife and mother. Has not the late Emperor William borne eloquent testimony to the influence of that mother, who at all times was his guiding star?

Even before the turn of the tide came, and the wave of French invasion was hurled back which was destined in course of time to exhaust itself on a barren Atlantic island, that happy gift of the Hohenzollerns, the capacity of choosing the best advisers, shone out anew, and Stein, Hardenberg, and Scharnhorst helped to prepare the rebuilding of the shattered national edifice.

V

To admit that, after 1815, a period of reaction set in that bade many patriots grow anxious for the prospects of their country is only to say that there are periods of dull apathy in the life of nations as well as in that of individuals. But even during the reign of Frederick William IV., dimmed as it was by Prussia's abject political rôle, we can still trace that endeavor of the crown to raise the culture and increase the happiness of the people.

While an iron tyranny marked the administration of Austria, as well as of the minor German states, there was at least an earnest good-will on the part of Frederick William. The impetus he gave to science

and philosophy, though perhaps not visibly productive at the time, yet did its share in preparing the public mind for the great events that were to follow. His romantic idealism, which in its aberration unselfishly and modestly looked up to an old-fashioned political oracle such as Metternich¹ as an authority in the art of making a people happy—even this weakness was not without its useful lesson for his successors. For it indirectly tended to emphasize the growing conviction on the part of the select few that sooner or later only a struggle of life and death could unite Germany.

This and more we have witnessed in our time, and here again we find a Hohenzollern king at hand, the first to recognize the signs of the times, with almost supernatural instinct in the detection of merit, taking the foremost place in the onward march of events, and realizing the German dream of centuries of national unity and independence. For although without a Bismarck the Germany of to-day might have been, without the late Emperor William it could not have been.

In him truly Germany produced a great character, a force often far more decisive in the shaping of destiny than all the arts of Machiavelli. And in his case the words of Goethe, that only men of eminence are capable of recognizing the truly great, find their fit application in the relationship of the emperor to his paladins.

¹ Metternich was a diplomatist who was supreme in Austria's councils, and by his craft largely controlled the policy of Europe from 1815 until 1848. He represented the "reaction," *i. e.*, the effort of continental monarchs to reassert and reestablish the "divine right" which the French Revolution had virtually destroyed. The main efforts of the reaction were to exercise censorship of the press, regulate university teaching, refuse or curtail constitutional government, and forcibly to suppress political revolutions throughout Europe.

Brought up in the feudal ideas of a monarchy existing by the grace of God, he lived to discern the sterling character and strength of that people he had once contemptuously treated as populace. And that people in its turn learned to understand, to appreciate, and lastly to idolize the grand old warrior who, amidst every additional luster of his reign, remained the same in God-fearing modesty and in his attachment to what he conceived to be his mission and his duty.¹ This enthusiasm of the people increased as the old hero exceeded the age usually allotted to man; and when his ninetieth birthday came around it seemed as if the religious element had mingled with the loyalty of a nation before an historical figure whose career can find no parallel in fiction. On that day well might the German students, two thousand strong, bear torches in his honor, and halting before his palace windows cheer to the address of their leader: "His Majesty, our most gracious kaiser, the victorious leader in numerous battles, the unifier of Germany's princes and people, the father of his country, the custodian of the peace of Europe, the creator of a new ideal world—long may he live!"

The incidents of his death, which followed so soon afterward, are still familiar to us all. We remember how, after calling in vain for his suffering son, "Fritz, lieber Fritz," almost the last words of the old warrior were a keynote to his entire life: "I have no time to be tired." But let us give place to one with rare

¹ History will not omit to note what was perhaps one of the noblest traits of his character, when in 1870 the old king preferred to accept a diplomatic defeat—almost a personal humiliation—rather than inflict the misery of war on his people. We know now how difficult it was to bring him to subscribe to the declaration of war.—*Vide* Emperor Frederick's diary.

powers of judgment as well as opportunities of exercising them, and whose verdict, if that of a stanch patriot, is at least not that of a time-server—of a Saxon, and not of a Prussian:¹

The Emperor William I. reached the highest pinnacle of worldly fame gradually in one continually rising progress, showing himself equal to every new task as it came before him. The man who united Germany, and gave her for the first time for centuries the unsullied joy of victory, has only sunk to rest to unite a whole people in sorrow round his grave.

In the years during which the character of man is supposed to shape itself, his highest ambition could scarcely have exceeded the hope of commanding the troops of his father or of his brother. In these years he lived in retirement, sharing the views of Prussia's best intellect, that the constitution of federal Germany was as unsatisfactory as the state of her west frontier, and that only a last decisive struggle could give the German nation independence. He held on to this hope, and saw clearly that only a strong Prussia would be able to break the pressure of powerful surrounding states, and fulfill the national destiny.

Thus he became a soldier, heart and soul, loved for his personal amiability, and feared for his severity in matters of discipline, which showed even the humblest subaltern that an exacting and stern eye was upon him. Others slightly mis-took for useless play-soldiering what was in reality a deep political game.

Public opinion indulged in radical dreams; it went into ecstasies in brotherly enthusiasm for Poles and Frenchmen, and hoped for a millennium of peace. In its conceit it could not understand the rough military ardor and sense of duty of this Prussian prince in its bearing on the future of the country.

In his opposition to organic changes in the constitution he encountered all the hatred of party; he warned his brother that Parliament would abuse its power of granting taxation by

¹ "Zwei Kaiser," by Heinrich von Treitschke, professor of history in the University of Berlin. Vol. LXII of "Preussische Jahrbücher" (Prussian Year-Books).



EMPEROR WILLIAM I

weakening the army. His warnings were not heeded, and as he had before given up the love of his youth to the call of duty to the state, so now he ceased all opposition when once the decision of the king his brother was taken. And like a knight of old he, as the first subject, took on his own shoulder all the unpopularity that threatened to discharge itself upon the crown.

The revolution broke out. A rabid hate, a storm of misconception, poured over his head and drove him into exile; only the army that knew him never wavered in its devotion, and at the bivouac fires in Schleswig-Holstein the soldiers sang:

Prince of Prussia, brave and true,
Return and cheer thy troops anew,
Much-beloved general.

And when he returned from the exile which he had accepted for his brother's sake, he honestly and unreservedly coöperated in the spirit of the new order of things.

Years afterward the illness of Frederick William IV. put him at the head of affairs. Two years later the death of the king placed the crown on his head. After short days of popular joy and uncertain expectation, he had to feel the fitful character of popular favor, and to begin that battle which, as heir to the throne, he had foreseen—the battle for his own work, the reorganization of the army. The hatred of party grew to such intensity as was only possible among the descendants of the sufferers by the Thirty Years' War; the German comic papers even represented this manly, true-hearted soldier's face as that of a tiger. The struggle reached such a height that only the decisive power of military success could cut the knot, and prove the rights of the monarch.

And these successes came in those memorable seven years which summed up the results of two centuries of Prussian history. Blow after blow, all these questions found their solution, to the attainment of which the diplomacy of Prussia had worked for generations.

The last of German boundaries in the North was torn from Scandinavian grasp; the battle of Sadowa secured what had

been missed at Kolin,¹ the liberation of Germany from the hegemony of the House of Austria. Then at last, by a sequence of unrivaled victories, the coronation at Versailles set the seal on and exceeded what in days gone by the men of 1813 had fondly hoped for.

Gratefully the Prussians recognized that their institutions were now more safeguarded than ever under a powerful sovereign; for, immediately after the War of 1866, the king, who had shown himself to be so thoroughly in the right, voluntarily offered atonement for the technical breach of the constitution, and not a word of bitterness ever came to his lips to call up the differences of the past. The whole German people had for the first time gained the feeling of national pride, and, in the joy of their new condition, forgotten the discord of centuries.

Through all these wondrous events—events that might have intoxicated even the brain of the most sober—King William comes before us unchanged in kindliness, firmness, and modesty. He himself believed that only a short span would be granted him to see the first beginning of the new order of things. But it was ordained otherwise, and far more beneficially. Not only did he live to complete the legal groundwork of the new empire, but to add to the stability of the edifice by the power of his individuality. At first the allied German princes only saw a diminution of their own power in the new order of things. But soon they learnt to regard it as an extra guarantee of their own rights; for one of their own number it was who wore the crown, and his fidelity was a bond of safety for all. Thus through the emperor's doing, and even against the opinion expressed by Bismarck, it came to pass that the Bundesrath, which at first had been looked upon as the seed-bed of dissension, in a few short years became the most reliable guarantee of unity, while the Reichstag drifted into a helpless plaything of parties.

The emperor never possessed a confidant who advised him on every subject. With rare knowledge of mankind he dis-

¹ Kolin, the severest defeat Frederick the Great sustained during the Seven Years' War at the hands of the Austrian commander, Field-Marshal Daun.

covered the best men to advise and assist him. With the freedom from envy only belonging to a great heart, he left full scope to those he had tried, but each one, even Bismarck, only in his own department. He always remained emperor, by whose hands alone were held all the threads of power.

The highest happiness of his life came to him when, after having escaped assassination as if by miracle, he met the enemies of society with that generous imperial message¹ which aimed at striking at the root of the fundamental evils of society in our time. Only since then has the nation thoroughly realized what it possessed in its emperor. A current of popular affection hereafter carried him along. Europe came to look upon the old warrior as the guardian of the peace of the world. At home the strong monarchical character of his government was confirmed year by year. The personal will of the sovereign wielded its good right side by side with that of Parliament, and now with the warm approval of better informed public opinion. The Germans knew that their emperor always did what was right and necessary, and in his simple unadorned language always "said what was to be said," as Goethe has it. Even in fields of effort for which he had originally no natural bent, his innate discernment soon found its bearings. How much the ideal work of the nation owes to him! Yet among artists and men of science he never distinguished an unworthy one.

VI

We all remember how the hopes of more than one nation centered around the sick-bed of his dying son, as we all know how they were doomed to disappointment. The grave closed over the purest embodiment of what is noble in the German character, for Frederick retained the idealism of youth even in middle age. Had he lived, the world would have seen how far such a nature would have been able to reconcile

¹ The message of February, 1881, to the working classes.

the differences and antagonisms still latent in the Fatherland.

He was the hope of the advanced Liberals, not only in Germany, but beyond its borders. On the other hand, there are some—and by no means the least high-minded—who inclined to the belief that his goodness might have been abused, his trust misplaced, and that he did not possess the hardness necessary to guide the national helm in troublous times. There are some who hold that a noble nature is not identical with a good and great ruler. It is no guarantee against one of the greatest dangers of sovereigns—the misplacing of confidence. A trivial matter in a private citizen, in a ruler it is often one of supreme national importance. Some critics point to the late Emperor William—in this respect—as almost of superhuman discernment, and compare him with the Emperor Frederick, who many believe not only misplaced his confidence in a physician, but, of greater moment, misplaced his confidence in one, at least, to whom he confided his diary. Some, again, aver that the influence of the empress his wife—so well intentioned—was not happy in this respect. Many think Germany is hardly ripe for that cosmopolitan breadth and generosity of view and sympathy which distinguished Frederick III.

Through his rare simplicity and affability of manner he gained the popular heart as none had done before him; but whether that kindliness of disposition, that earnest, almost feverish, desire for the welfare of all, would have enabled him to carry out his benevolent plans, none can tell. Some think that a man of his romantic bent would have strongly resented a mis-

judgment of his aims. That he was capable of strong, almost passionate, decision, the sudden dismissal of Herr von Puttkamer¹—the one noticeable act of his short reign—seems to prove.

His was essentially the generous temperament of the romantic idealist; whether he would have shown the same unimpassioned front to opposition and misjudgment, the same greatness of character in forgiving it, as his great father, the world can never know. Had he lived, we believe his rule would have proved a bitter disappointment to some of those who foolishly tried to claim him as a partisan. In many things the late emperor reminds us of that noble and romantic Hohenstaufen, the Emperor Frederick II. Full of the most ideal and romantic yearnings, and himself of the highest cultivation of the mind, he lived to see his plans thwarted, and then to die of a broken heart.

Germany cannot yet afford to be ideally romantic or cosmopolitan in sentiment. She is still—perhaps more than ever—in want of a strong rallying-point, at all hazards, which shall unite the nation and enable it to rise above meaner interests in moments of supreme peril.

Even a superficial glance at what the Hohenzollerns have been to their country bids us understand that the backbone of the Prussian nation has been loath to pin its faith to foreign models of parliamentarism. It clung to its own monarchy, in which the sovereign was not only the first servant of the state, but its true

¹ A Prussian politician and an extreme Conservative, who was vice-president of the ministry from 1881 to 1888. His dismissal arose from his objection to certain reform measures promulgated by Emperor Frederick III.

beacon-tower in victory as well as in adversity. While republicans consistently choose to do without heaven-born authority, there may be some people who would prefer to live in a country where the fountain of grace is a high-minded monarch rather than the temporary chief of a party. The loyal Prussians have hitherto had more than an excuse for preferring the coöperation of Parliament to its autocratic supremacy, as we have it in England.

Hitherto they have been justified in so doing. With them loyalty was not a middle-class myth, but a reality, pulsating in the heart of the peasant, the educated classes, as well as in that of the noble next to the throne. And no wonder it was so, for during generations, while some royal families have done everything to extirpate such a feeling in their own countries, the Hohenzollerns have uniformly fostered and strengthened it. From Frederick William I.—the creator of Prussia's official organization—down to the present day, this was ever strongly marked.

While the German aristocracy still clings to its traditions of birth-privilege, the Hohenzollerns have bridged the old lines of demarcation, and have hitherto striven to attract intellect and merit of every class within their circle. Authors, painters, and men of science—invariably the best of each class—were often not merely patronized, but distinguished in a manner reminding us of the times of the Medici, and of Pope Julius II., who followed the sulking Michael Angelo to Bologna: "In the stead of your coming to us, you seem to have expected that we should attend upon you." Even here we find an analogy in the visit of

the late Emperor William to Bayreuth, although that ungrateful egotistical genius, Richard Wagner, showed himself anything but appreciative of imperial favor.

Not only is every Prussian prince bound to learn a handicraft, as if to bring his sympathies within scope of the humblest, but the very poorest subjects have ever been able to petition the sovereign directly. Thus, loyalty is not a sentiment of vague attachment to an unknown, unseen lay-figure, but is distinctly personal. It shows itself, not in the gratification of vulgar curiosity—the hunting after a show; it is sunk deep in the heart as an impetus to strengthen patriotism and duty.

The action of the Hohenzollerns has strengthened the monarchical principle far beyond the borders of the Fatherland. Formerly a spark would have sufficed to consume most of the German petty royal courts. The Saxon monarchy was only saved in 1849 by the Prussian guards sweeping the streets of Dresden with musketry. Since then the loyalty of the people of the petty principalities has become stronger, under the guiding sun of Prussia. Formerly many of the best intellects of Germany were democratic, if not republican; they have since become monarchical.

Thus stood tradition and actuality when the present emperor, William II., succeeded to the throne at the death of his father—now more than twelve years ago.

Public opinion, which had been ready to credit the late Emperor Frederick with every imaginable virtue, showed its usual hasty partiality in estimating his son. If the general impression was one rather mingled with doubt and fear, on the other hand, those who had

enjoyed the privilege of personal intercourse with Prince William were extravagantly optimistic with regard to what the nation might confidently expect from him as German emperor and king of Prussia. While many were inclined to credit the young monarch with bellicose leanings—and this was perhaps the most prevalent impression also outside Germany—those of his admirers who had enjoyed opportunities for forming a personal opinion did not hesitate to aver that their youthful monarch would turn out to be nothing less than a Frederick the Great all along the line. Already to-day it is sufficiently apparent that those who distrusted the emperor because of his supposed warlike proclivities did him an injustice. With regard to the more flattering estimate of his character, the Emperor William has it still in his power to prove its justification. For the present it is obviously too early to judge him either as a man or as a ruler, although now that he has had over twelve years' experience as a sovereign he is hardly in a position to claim indulgent criticism for his actions on the score of youth and inexperience. His position is an exceedingly difficult one; for Germany was never more in need of a strong character at the helm than at the present moment. Nor can it in common fairness be contested that the Emperor William has always shown an earnest desire to act up to the high standard expected of him and to prove himself to be the man Germany is in want of for the greater happiness and welfare of the Fatherland.

It would scarcely be fit to take leave of this chapter without a word of appreciation for two men who,

next to the Hohenzollerns themselves, have of royal princes done most for the cause of German unity. The first is the ruling grand-duke of Baden, the son-in-law of the late Emperor William. In him Germany possesses a high-minded prince. In the most democratic state of Germany he is the most popular sovereign. He it was who, in 1871, helped more than any one in the creation of the German Empire,¹ and gave the late half-crazy king of Bavaria the option of proposing the measure, determined to do so himself in case of refusal. And, again, at the accession of the present emperor, it was he who, hastening to Berlin, gave the example that induced every ruling sovereign of Germany to be present at the ceremony.

King Albert of Saxony is to-day the one royal prince left who held high command in the memorable War of 1870-71. In fact, Count Moltke's opinion of his strategic abilities was of the very highest, for it stands on record, vouched for by Moltke himself, that at the battle of Sedan the then crown prince of Saxony instinctively foresaw and on his own responsibility acted upon the exact instructions which, thought out by the chief of the staff, led to the results of that momentous day. But King Albert's reputation as a soldier does not rest alone on his achievements in the War of 1870. In 1866, in Bohemia, his handling of the Saxon army has been admitted on all hands to have been excellent. Although he must in earlier days have been a strong anti-Prussian, King Albert has loyally accepted the leadership of Prussia, and to-day

¹ This assertion has since been amply proved by the publication of the late Emperor Frederick's diary.

there is no more trusted adviser of the emperor, no man individually more respected in Germany than he. For not only has he ever shown a bold face to the foe, but his remarkable and honest career bears eloquent testimony to the victory he must have achieved over his narrower self.

SUMMARY

The House of Hohenzollern has proved the salvation of modern Germany. In striking contrast with other German princes, the Hohenzollerns served the state, dispensed justice, and were monarchs of the poor. They have educated the nation and have impressed upon it an iron sense of duty. Frederick William I. found the country devastated and poor; he encouraged immigration, inaugurated many vital internal improvements, and bettered the condition of the peasantry. Frederick the Great allowed the utmost religious toleration and continued the creation of a free peasant class. The greatest of the Hohenzollerns, William I., realized that only through Prussia could German national independence be secured. Though bitterly opposed, he finally won the hearts of the nation, gained back German possessions, and was crowned at Versailles as emperor of Germany. Frederick III. possessed the generous temperament of a romantic idealist, and held as had no other Hohenzollern the good-will of the people. It may be questioned whether this temperament would have been equal to the demands made upon him as a ruler. The spirit of this house has been to strengthen the central power by making the government efficient. A personal loy-

alty to the ruler has been fostered; the country has faith in a monarchy; many of the best intellects formerly republican have become monarchical. The present emperor has shown many of the strong qualities of his house, but it is too early to judge of the effect of these upon the national life.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. What characteristic qualities have the Hohenzollerns possessed from the earliest times?
2. Compare the early Prussian rulers with those of other German states.
3. What is the secret of the sovereign's power in Prussia?
4. What wise measures of the Great Elector strengthened his hold upon the poor aristocracy?
5. How did Frederick William I. bring his impoverished kingdom into a state of prosperity?
6. What tolerant spirit was shown by Frederick the Great?
7. What reforms did he introduce?
8. How was Frederick William III.'s consideration for his people shown?
9. Who was Metternich?
10. Describe the character of William I.
11. What impression did Frederick III. make upon the men of his time?
12. What has been the Hohenzollern policy toward men of talent?
13. What is the privilege of direct appeal?
14. What qualities as a ruler has the present emperor shown?
15. What distinguished services to the nation were rendered by the grand-duke of Baden?
16. What by King Albert of Saxony?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- William of Germany. Archibald Forbes.
Life and Times of Stein. L. B. Seeley.
Europe in the Nineteenth Century. H. P. Judson.
The Nineteenth Century. Robert Mackenzie.
History of Modern Europe. C. A. Fyffe.
The Historical Development of Modern Europe. C. M.
Andrews.
The Refounding of the German Empire. Malleon.

CHAPTER V

PATERNAL GOVERNMENT

For forms of government let fools contest;
Whate'er is best administered is best.

—*Pope.*

I

Among students of history, as well as of political science, two schools of thought stand at daggers drawn. The one would have us believe that every ripple of the tide in the affairs of man is the result of infinite, remote, collective, and at last overpowering influence; something like the cracking of the earth's crust when the gases in its bowels seek and find an outlet. Therefore, this particular school is against all undue and premature initiative and interference of the state in the affairs of the community. This is the thought underlying the English national political organization of the present day, and, if human temperament may be brought into analogy with an intellectual conviction, it may safely be put down as a manifestation of the phlegmatic, unimaginative, negative disposition. It may be an unattractive creed to some, but England's insular position has allowed her to become the nation she is while practicing it.

The other school leans on the past, on the lessons of the great epoch-making figures in history, those

who were not so much children of their time as themselves part creators of the events they directed. It pins its faith to a strong and high-minded monarchy, assisted by capable advisers, and working out its ruling mission by harmonizing a strong traditional state power with the just pretension of the present time. This school holds that parliamentary party government is unsuited to direct the destinies of a great nation; that the opinions of a majority offer no guarantee of its soundness.

II

It has been said that we are never so thoroughly in the right that our opponents are wholly in the wrong. May it not be so with two opposing schools of political thought? May not both be right in much, while each bears distinct evidence of its peculiar shortcomings? An aristocratic monarchy run to seed was the cause of the battle of Jena and the temporary effacement of Prussia from the map of Europe as a great power. The history of the decay of republics is equally suggestive.

The form of government which succeeds best in developing the central idea of the state, backed up by the best instincts and unselfish devotion of its subjects, is the best; and every form of government, except, perhaps, an elective monarchy, has from time to time succeeded in solving the problem, and high-minded men have always been the means of its solution. The first condition of every government is the purity of the fountain-head. Every plan for the happiness of man suffers shipwreck when mean natures are allowed to

influence its working. The United States does not owe its greatness merely to the chance of its being dubbed a republic. America is studded with rotten republics, but the United States owes its stability to the fact of its founders having been great characters sprung from one of the finest races of manhood in the world. Purified by a baptism of blood, they framed a great constitution, which tended to bring out what was good in the people and to render impotent what was vile. This constitution was suited to the Anglo-Saxon race.

But after all, are not the natural conditions of a nation's existence the deciding factors in the choice of the means of its salvation? In other words, are not the race, the climate of a country, its geographical position, greater factors than a chance constitution? Is the continuity of England's national independence and progress not owing more to natural conditions than to any set political creed? Our political system may have suited our requirements, but the silver streak that separates us from the Continent fixed its character.

One of the reasons why some nations have an instinctive antipathy to a powerful executive is that they have never known any that was not at the same time thoroughly rotten and corrupt. If the choice lie between a vicious paternal government and a corrupt parliament, it is natural to hesitate.

Thus, in England we are brought up to look askance at state interference and, above all, at "grandmotherly legislation." Up to the present, circumstances have enabled us to feel that we were justified in doing so,

and Manchester theories¹ may be all very well when there are no frontiers to guard, no external enemies that threaten. If, however, such be not the fortunate condition of a nation, and its whole destiny and policy are not to be evolved from the free expression of public opinion, then the success of Louis XIV. dragonading the Palatinate, and the ease with which the left bank of the Rhine subsequently became French in sympathies, show us what to expect. High aims dwell only in the few high-strung natures, whatever their birth.

III

One consideration we cannot ignore—namely, that no country can possibly formulate its laws and policy by the gradual, irresistible expression of public opinion, unless the following essential conditions are present, and allow a strong healthy public opinion to come into existence: national independence; strong, healthy, national self-consciousness; final subordination of class interests to the welfare of the state.

Till lately Germany possessed none of these three indispensable qualifications, and without them it was useless to talk of a nation's public opinion. The want of them not only caused the dismemberment of the old German Empire and made Germany the battle-field of Europe for two centuries, but precluded the possibility of a public opinion coming into existence which could have materially helped to produce them. They had to be created against the machinations of old and

¹ The so-called Manchester school of political economists stands for a policy of non-interference by the state in industrial and commercial affairs.

powerful enemies at home and abroad. If France had understood her true policy, German unity would never have been accomplished. Thus the three necessary qualities of national life had to be conquered, and genius alone could hold aloft the banner around which those should congregate who were resolved to do or die in their attainment. Men had to be called upon who would be ready to shed blood—their own and their enemies'.

The wealthy middle classes of to-day, for instance, are distinctly averse to blood-letting. And yet in time and season there is no cement like blood. Even the history of the greatest republic of our time—the United States, a country whose practical philanthropy none can deny—absolutely proves that.

Thus the Germans shed blood—rivers of it—and attained national independence. But even now they hold it only by the power of the sword; for national consciousness has not yet had time to form, and the feeling of subordination of class interests is still very weak, as is also, in many places, the feeling of patriotism. Yet the Germans can only hope to retain what they have gained by strengthening those qualities which are still unreliable. Hence the straining of every nerve by their rulers to attain that end, and paternal government, based on the coöperation of all, is the means to that end.

IV

A strong, healthy public opinion, born of a long and prosperous political education, which might dispense with paternal government and work out its own

will unfettered, does not, and cannot, exist as yet. Among other things, the small interest shown by the voters at elections proves this. For, judged by polling results, the Social Democrats are at present the most earnest political party in Germany. It should also be remembered that public opinion in Germany was never intended to rule directly, as it does with us; but at most only indirectly, by entrusting men of mark with the direction of affairs. When public opinion has no longer the "touch" to recognize leaders, it is time for it to give way, and allow something better to take its place.

Yet, notwithstanding that what has been gained is distinctly traceable to the action of genius guiding the sword, there was till recently a strong party in Germany which believed in English political methods. These people would fain have seen our principles adopted, and prophesied all sorts of evil from their non-acceptance. Their adherents failed to see that their countrymen had no choice; they had either to accept salvation the way it came, or go on in the hopeless helplessness of the past.

The Germans never had independent leisure to work out their political and economical life according to *laissez-faire*¹ principles. They could not afford to ask themselves whether great men come too rarely to entrust one, when he does appear, with powers that might descend to reckless or unworthy wielders. The circumstances of the country's existence left them no choice but to be thankful when light did appear.

¹ *Laissez-faire* ("let alone") is the classical phrase which describes the non-intervention policy.

It was individual genius that burst the shutters of medieval darkness, and hailed the dawn of a new era, when Luther uttered those memorable words at Worms: "Here I stand. I cannot do otherwise. God help me. Amen!" It was the lack of national consciousness, the want of national independence, and of the due subordination of petty ruling interests which robbed the German nation of the first fruits of what has since become the common property of mankind. It was the possession of those requisites in England which enabled us to hold up the standard of the Reformation against the power of Catholic Spain.

Again, in our time we have seen political genius in Germany, having achieved national independence, striving honestly to attain national well-being and endeavoring to strengthen the sentiment of national consciousness. It asked all classes alike to coöperate in the work of national greatness. No country was in such need of great men, and in few countries hitherto have the masses been so unable to realize the imperious necessity of their advent.

Whereas there is not an Italian living who does not mourn the death of Cavour, there are yet many men in Germany who welcomed the death of a Bismarck! Others appreciate great men. Germany has produced them in our time.

V

To judge the atmospherical conditions of a room full of people, you must come in from the open air, and you will quickly be able to make a comparison. A nation's civilization is like artificial temperature:

you must gauge it from outside; you must compare it. Is Germany's greatness a plant of recent and tender growth which requires constant care in order to enable it to develop in the future and stand on its own merits, a bulwark of civilization in Europe? We think it is. Are those who are responsible for its destinies conscious of the difficulties of the task before them, and honestly intent on meeting them? We feel convinced that they are, and we shall endeavor to point out in how far we can show reason for this belief. One of the reasons why the French so easily gained popularity on the left bank of the Rhine at the beginning of the century was, that they represented a young, healthy, popular principle, and the Germans an old, antiquated, feudal system.

The principal reason why the Alsatians so soon lost the old ties with the German Empire (for Strassburg was treacherously seized upon by Louis XIV. in the midst of peace) and still partially cling to France was, that they grew into the traditions of the powerful state they joined. The old German Empire was effete, if not rotten to the core, and when the French Revolution came it found the Alsatians belonging to a nation that proclaimed the "rights of man," and, casting medieval lumber to the flames, declared every channel open to the ambition of the humblest. Small wonder that the good Alsatian peasants and burghers were proud of their new country, and forgot the violent manner in which their new paternity had been foisted on them!

Now all this has changed, and the Alsatians have only to rub their eyes in order to see that in coming

back to their original Fatherland they have come back to the victorious mother-country with far more to tempt them than the country which treated them so step-motherly while they belonged to it. If the Alsations were practical Englishmen, they would see the position of affairs in a trice, and, after the last fair stand-up fight, make the best of it and be friends with the new order of things. But the poor Alsations are sentimental Germans; they feel the sorrows of their late fellow-countrymen, and, in their sympathy, are still blind to their own interests, and to the real facts of the case. Time will enlighten them, and a strong, healthy, paternal government—not one *à la* Metternich, but conducted in harmony with the spirit of the age—will assist in doing so.

VI

German Liberals chafe under the restraints of their paternal government, and doubtless the stern system which holds them together has its drawbacks. They would prefer public opinion, expressed through their party, to rule the nation and supply its needs. A look at their past efforts in this direction and at their latest action does not lead an outsider to feel that Germany is ripe for that humanitarian democracy which substitutes the tyranny of the many for the honest and conscientious effort of a concentrated executive.

If it be granted that a strong military government is essential to the nation's existence—and that cannot be denied, though it may be deplored—then the

dissatisfaction at its unavoidable drawbacks must be taken for what it is worth. Without underrating the great value of a strong and healthy public opinion, it is yet permissible to hold that its expression is not the only source of salvation of a country, the less so as it is likely to wield as much power when diseased as when it is sound. England herself has been saved more than once by miracle from the consequences of some of its diseased manifestations. The cry of misery and the despair of millions have forced public opinion to remedy some of our imperious wants, but much remains undone that paternal government in Germany has accomplished, as a few illustrations later on may enable us to judge.

An English member of Parliament writes to the *Times* deploring that a public meeting cannot be held in Berlin without the presence of a police agent, who may close it at a moment's notice. This is a sad truth; but the freedom of talk has not yet led to a millennium in other countries. Far from it. The unlimited free expression of public opinion is all very well where there are no enemies at the gates; but it is a dangerous pastime for a nation which might be called upon to-morrow to fight for its existence, and which would be jeopardized by talk. Germany is not stable enough to allow itself such a luxury.

If the happiness of the greatest number be—once national independence is secured—the end and aim of all government, it is but fair to glance backward and determine, as far as possible, in how far paternal government endeavors to secure that end. In the first place, the ascendancy of Prussia, which led to German

unity, was gained against the almost universal expression of public opinion. Public opinion has since recanted in this instance, and thus the book is closed; but history is nevertheless bound to take note of the fact.

Unity accomplished, Germany expected to see capable, conscientious men at the head of every department of the state. We know how uniformly these expectations have hitherto been realized. This has all been done without the assistance of public opinion to guide the choice of the directing minds. But neither was it necessary. Without the action of public opinion, the shaft of duty is sunk deep in the heart and mind of the people and their rulers.

With us public opinion is invariably "surprised" and extravagantly "grateful" when it finds anybody equal to the emergencies of a position of responsibility. And, unfortunately, ignominious failure, even involving disaster and national humiliation, still allows a man to continue posing in public as an organ of the sentiments of the nation. The uniform success of German foreign policy under Prince Bismarck's guidance is well known and admitted on every hand, even down to that mysterious little Bulgarian-Battenberg incident, some years ago, which public opinion was only too willing to fan into a European conflagration, until stopped by a jet of cold water from Berlin.

Not so well known may be the success of Prussia in conciliating the countries annexed in 1864 and 1866. Schleswig-Holstein, which certain powers wished to protect against itself, is thoroughly German to-day. The electorate of Hesse-Cassel is thoroughly Prussian-

ized, and as for Hanover, the great center of Guelphic memories and partisanship, the freely elected Parliament (Landtag) of Hanover recently showed only three Guelphic adherents, against twenty-eight belonging to the Bismarckian National-Liberal party. Alsace, it is true, is a long way from such a satisfactory state of things; but it will come—gradually, but surely.

Even the conciliation of a single town has not been beneath the earnest attention of paternal government. The town of Frankfort, after being terribly frightened and feeling the grip of the conqueror round its neck, has since been petted and pampered in every conceivable way. Showy cavalry regiments were quartered in the town to see what effect bright colors and the accomplishments of the pick of officers could have on the female heart; the late Emperor William came repeatedly in person; even the treaty of 1871 was signed in Frankfort-on-the-Main. Thus, the commerce-gorged citizen of that ilk, after raving at the wickedness of Prussia, and accepting Swiss naturalization in order to avoid military service, has long since come back to the Prussian sheepfold, humble and full of contrition. And to-day the bleary eye of the regulation type of Frankfort patrician lights up when he is privileged to pour his sing-song dialect into the ear of the youngest long-suffering Prussian subaltern. Thus the Prussians, after meeting a world in arms, have shown that they understand the more subtle art of stroking the backs of their newly annexed subjects; and to-day no more loyal subjects exist than the good burghers of the town of Frankfort-on-the-Main.

VII

The victory was won; but it only urged paternal government to criticize and amend a system the success of which had dazzled the world.' All Europe was anxious to copy what had produced such results; it impressed everybody but its authors. They set to work to improve it, and the result is that the army of to-day is no longer the army of 1870. The military authorities have devoted twenty-six years' unremitting work to its improvement. What this means will be brought home to the reader when we recall the historical fact that the organization and armament of the English army on the outbreak of the Crimean War in 1854 differed very little from that of the time of the battle of Waterloo in 1815.

What paternal government has done for the defenses of the country is patent to the world. But its silent, hidden action is even more instructive than its outward achievements. While public opinion in France is delighted with the perforating effects of a new rifle on pauper corpses, while the English wake up to find the millions spent on their rifles, ships, and guns squandered, paternal government in Germany has quietly seen to the efficiency of the last button of the Pomeranian's uniform!

Public opinion breathes not a word—no newspaper propaganda—but eyes that never close watch the frontiers of the Fatherland. In the west the fortresses of Metz and Strassburg look so radiantly innocent on a bright summer's day, you would hardly fancy that, unheeded by public opinion, they have been so strength-

ened and enlarged that those who were familiar with them now hardly recognize them. But strategists know that a sea of a quarter of a million of men might well pause for fear of breaking its waves against their buttresses in vain!

Whereas England, after converting the Enfield rifle into the Snider, discarded it and spent millions on the Martini, only again to find it obsolete to-day, paternal government immediately after 1870 introduced the Mauser rifle,¹ which even now, after twenty-six years, can still be safely looked upon as equal to any emergency. And here we are impressed by a marked contrast. While we in England make the best articles, our government generally secures the worst at the dearest price. In Germany, the home of the cheap and poor, the government always secures the best article at a low price.

Nothing, however trivial, is too small for the attention of paternal government. Ever since 1871 a ceaseless, but severely systematic, series of trials has been going on to improve every article of equipment of the common soldier. Companies are sent on forced marches to test the value of new knapsacks, new gaiters; even new drinking-flasks are tried, and the common soldier is interrogated by the emperor as to how he is satisfied with them. In England, according to occasionally recurring newspaper disclosures, the soldiers are defectively fed in time of peace. In Germany, only lately a new kind of bread has been tested to replace the old military army bread. It is not sub-

¹ This statement is not invalidated by the recent introduction of the repeating rifle.

mitted to the apathetic eye of some mighty official, backed by the recommendation of those who have an interest in getting the contract to supply the army with bread. Paternal government does not work like that.¹ The advantages possessed by the new bread are set forth, and after their conscientious scrutiny, the Ministry of War gives orders that it shall be tried for a period of three months in a number of large garrisons, and the reports collected and compared. If these are favorable, the new bread will be immediately introduced into the whole army.

If such attention is bestowed on details, the reader can imagine what the work of paternal government has been with regard to more important matters. A friend of ours, the *beau-idéal* of a Prussian officer, who had passed through the War of 1870 as a lieutenant, had lately gone through the six weeks' training necessary to qualify him for the rank of captain. He assured us: "It is simply unbelievable what they ask of us now. I only wonder I was able to live through it all." Such are the tests of efficiency required nowadays in the Prussian army! If such be the severity with regard to petty officers, nobody will be surprised to learn that the weeding out that has been going on in the higher branches of the service is of a stern and radical kind. As pointed out elsewhere,

¹ As pointing against the spirit of the above, we are reminded of cases of bribery and corruption in the Prussian army and other departments of the state service which now and then become public. To that we reply that even Prussian institutions are only human and not infallible. But there is this great distinction to be noted in their working. In Prussia, abuses are discovered and sought to be remedied at all times. In other countries, only too often they come to light in the moment of supreme danger amidst a battle of life and death. We need only refer to the condition of things in England revealed during the Crimea, during the last Egyptian campaign, with the French in 1870, and with the Russians in the 1877 Bulgarian campaign.

neither past services, nor influence, nor family connections, have hitherto been allowed to sway the dispositions of paternal government. Soon after the accession of the present emperor a number of changes took place, many of which the old Emperor William, from personal ties, could not bring himself to make.

What paternal government has done for the education of the country, primary, classical, and technical, has been referred to elsewhere, and is besides too well known to require further mention. Having provided the nation with food for the mind, the best of its class, paternal government proceeds to see that the food of the body is not adulterated—no slight task among a people which, in commerce, lays its hands upon everything and counterfeits everything it can lay its hands on.

While in new-born Italy,¹ constitutional Austria, parliamentary England, republican France, and democratic America adulteration of every article of food is rampant, the paternal laws of Germany are of a nature to stop the most hardened offender. For the law provides that those who sell an adulterated article—even if shown to be ignorant of the offense—are liable to fine and imprisonment. And how that law is administered! In England, the spirit of the middle classes tells us, through John Bright, that adulteration is only a form of competition! While public opinion in Eng-

¹ The chemical examination of a so-called Italian "Magliani" cigar, made by the government in Piacenza, will give an idea to what extent adulteration is practiced in the sunny south. The cigar in question contained (1) a piece of lime, (2) powdered gypsum, (3) a quantity of humus, (4) a piece of wood, (5) a piece of string. As a Roman newspaper sarcastically put it, a mason with his trowel was only wanting in conjunction with a dozen such cigars in order to build a six-storied palace; the necessary materials were all there.

land allows not only the legitimation of quack medicines, but the realization also of one million two hundred thousand dollars a year¹ to the revenue by their taxation, the Prussian government either forbids their sale if poisonous, or analyzes them and causes their worthlessness to be made officially public, as in the following instance:

Warning against Patent Medicines.—An official scientific analysis of a medicine advertised under the name of "Schlagwasser," manufactured by Roman Weissmann in Vilshofen, has shown the following: It consists of nothing else save a little tincture of ratanhia, or kino, mixed with tincture of arnica, the value of which is between five cents and seven cents, whereas it is sold at two dollars a bottle. It is self-evident that this decoction does not possess the virtues attributed to it.

In England, such beneficial announcements are left to the initiative of the press, which (except in rare cases, such as, some years ago, the *Saturday Review*) does not publish them, because some papers draw a large income from advertising patent medicines.

VIII

After safeguarding the national existence and its bodily health, paternal government energetically pursues its care for the well-being and happiness of the greatest number in all the branches of this difficult task.

Subordinate to the Imperial Reichstag, but independent in its own sphere of action, each German state possesses its own parliament. And instead of con-

¹ Statistics dealing with amounts paid to the British government in the form of a tax on patent medicines in the financial year 1895-96.

tributing to foment petty rivalries, as of old, these parliaments now attend to the legitimate satisfaction of local wants—the most perfect form of local government. The Bundesrath (Federal Council), in which every smaller state is represented and can exercise a fair share of influence, has proved itself an excellent guardian of the national interests.

When Germany was reorganized after 1870, a perfect babel of conflicting law codes were found in force. For instance, Bavaria alone possessed seventy-eight different civil codes, such towns as Bamberg, Nuremberg, and Augsburg each having a special law code of its own. In the beginning of the eighties a commission was appointed and worked for eight years at the new uniform civil code for the empire. The results of its labors, after being submitted to the criticism of practical lawyers, were passed into law and gradually, in the course of three years, adopted throughout the country. The new commercial and criminal laws (*Reichsgesetz*) are already in force; the highest tribunal is situated outside of Prussia proper, in Leipzig. It is indeed, according to universal testimony, a marvelous monument of erudition and honest effort to reconcile conflicting interpretations of law, and to meet the legal wants of the nation in the spirit of the time.

Not only is law cheap in Germany—perhaps in some ways too cheap—but it is in stern reality the same for the rich and the poor. The system of admitting to bail, one that tends to favor the rich, and one that is so often abused, is very limited. No offense punishable by more than a year's imprisonment is bailable at all. This may be a hardship in a few

cases, but it is a strong point nevertheless. Whether it be an ambassador or a professor—for the higher the position and capacity of doing harm, the greater the crime—who is accused of a serious crime, he stands on no better footing than the humblest transgressor of the laws.

The transfer of land, in England one of the costliest and most doubtful parts of our conveyancing system, is prompt, sure, and cheap in Germany.

As a result of the dire experience of speculation and commercial ruin in the years 1873-74, the laws affecting commercial companies, fraudulent bankruptcy, and embezzlement have been entirely recast, whereas in England we are still unable to get two judges to agree to one definition of the law on embezzlement. Thus it is not surprising that, since the great "crash" (*Krach*) of 1873, there has been comparatively little stock-company swindling in Germany, although in the meantime Berlin is fast outstripping Paris as a money market. During the same period we have witnessed in England the failure of the Glasgow Bank, of the Cardiff Savings Bank, of Greenways' Bank—not to mention the many millions the public has lost through other limited liability companies—bringing ruin and misery to thousands.

Again, while the administration of many English petty savings banks, of hospitals, and other charities has been impeached in public and shown to be wasteful, if not worse, the same classes of institution in Germany are more or less controlled by the state, and show a wonderfully clean record. The social laws concerning divorce and illegitimacy have not the

draconic character of our own—they are more humane; and yet we have to learn that there is less domestic happiness and more immorality in Germany than in England. The guardianship of lunatics is under the direct control of the state. Spendthrifts are, and habitual drunkards soon will be, deprived of the unlimited control of their fortunes; and although we in England are suspicious of such laws, fearing they might be abused, as they inevitably would be with us, there is no danger of their perversion in Germany.

In fact, the one failing of this stern paternal government is its humanitarianism. Its criminal code is far more merciful than our own, and until lately there was a strong probability of the total abolition of the death penalty. The murderous attempts of the socialists came in time to furnish a suitable occasion to reinstate it. But the attempts on the late Emperor William's life, far from blinding the government to the misery of the poor and the legitimate aspirations of the working classes, only seemed to direct attention to them; not in craven cowardice, but in genuine concern for the welfare of the people. The imperial message of February, 1881, to the Reichstag brought forward the earnest wish of the emperor himself to initiate legislation to improve the lot of the workman. Since then the laws for the benefit of the working classes have come into existence.

It is as yet impossible to gauge their benefit; but the imperial recognition of the right of the humblest to the consideration of the state must remain a grand monument to the honor of paternal government.

IX

Passing from a consideration of the laws of the country again to the activity of the state as an administrator, we find a model bureaucracy doing in civil life the part of the army as a defender against outward aggression.

The German postal service has become the pattern for all other countries. Nothing is too trivial for its attention, and nothing too remote to escape its eye. Whereas we have for many years put up with the disgraceful mail service between England and the Continent via Belgium,¹ and paid a ridiculous price for its transit via Ostend, the Germans took the initiative by sending their mails via Flushing; and now that the English authorities have joined their protests against the scandals of the Ostend line, the Belgians have been forced to put on new steamers. The express service shows a surplus, whereas the English, which was copied from it and is cheaper, shows a deficit. In the telegraph system, the Germans were the first to lay the wires underground on a large scale.

In England, public opinion is still fighting a continuous battle against the pretensions of private railway company monopolists. The price paid to the landowners for the privilege of running the lines over their property has saddled the public with the most expensive railway system in Europe. The cost of forcing the concessions through Parliament has in

¹ Not to forget the scandalous passenger service through France and Belgium. Here German paternal government, by its coöperation with the Dutch government, succeeded in starting the quick through service via Flushing to Berlin, and has thus rendered signal service to the traveling community.

course of time cost the companies millions. Thus we are not surprised to read that, although the five largest railway companies in England are virtual gold mines to the lucky shareholders, of 258 railways in England and Wales, 137, or more than one-half of the whole, paid no dividends whatever in 1884.¹ Yet the *Times* plaintively exclaims: "Our commerce is being throttled by the enormous cost of internal carriage; goods often cost more for a short transit to the coast than they subsequently do for sea-carriage to the ends of the earth."

Not only are the English railways more expensive than the German lines, but, except where competition forces a keen rivalry, they cannot compare for cleanliness, comfort, or punctuality. The dirt and unpunctuality on some of the English southern lines would be sought for in vain all over Germany, and the power of the press has hitherto proved unavailing to secure a remedy for these things.

One of the greatest tasks of paternal government has been the taking over of the railways by the state. It is still incomplete,² but almost all lines in Prussia proper are now state property. Hence there is now one system and one tariff where formerly close upon a thousand existed. How this one system works we hear from the best of English authorities, "Bradshaw's Guide," which states that the German railways are uniformly excellent. That the carriages of each class are better than those in England has long been admitted; and lately the American saloon-carriages are

¹ And things have not improved much in this respect since.

² In Bavaria the railways are still noted for their irregularity and inefficiency.

being widely introduced, not for one class only, as in England, but for all classes alike.

It would lead us too far to enter into every point of the German railway system; we will only mention that the minutest details for the comfort of the public are not beneath the direct notice of the minister of public works, Dr. von Maybach, who is the supreme head of the Prussian railway system. Whereas one of the latest postal reforms in England consists in being allowed to post a letter in a postal train with an extra stamp, in Germany not only has it long been permissible to do so without any extra stamp, but all trains carrying the mails accept telegrams also without extra charge.

The railway refreshment rooms—in England one of the crying scandals of the railway system, where the favored contractor is allowed to poison the public without let or hindrance—are regulated in Prussia with the utmost care and conscientiousness. Not only is every article which is sold tested, but the price charged is regulated by the authorities. Besides that, in every railway refreshment room all through the country (and most stations have one) a book is kept to enter any complaint made.

Only a short time ago a Liberal member of the Reichstag accused Dr. von Maybach of having disposed of a railway refreshment license by favor to an unqualified person. Dr. von Maybach proved that under his rule it was simply impossible that even the contract for a little refreshment room at a side station could be given away through influence of any kind. In England there are no refreshment rooms unless the

traffic is large enough to insure a good profit to the lessee, and then they are a disgrace to the railway system. But the end and aim of all the English railway companies is to secure big dividends.

Not only roads by land, but navigable rivers and canals, show signs of the unceasing care of the government. The former are uniformly kept in an excellent state of repair, and, in reference to the latter, the fact of the government piercing a canal from Kiel to Wilhelmshafen, at an expense of thirty-nine million dollars, speaks volumes for its initiative.¹ This canal, which is now completed, shortens the steam voyage from Hamburg to Cronstadt by forty-four hours, from London by twenty-two, and from Hull by fifteen. It has infused new life into the Baltic, and will do much to revive the prosperity of ancient cities like Dantzic on the Prussian coast, besides increasing the effectiveness of the German fleet.

Even the cultivation of fish is not beneath the attention of the government, and a state fish-breeding establishment at Hüningen in Alsace is the nucleus from which the pisciculture of the country receives fresh impulse and development.

X

The protectionist policy pursued with regard to native industries has yet to justify itself by results; in the meantime there can be no doubt of the temporary impulse it has given to trade. The Germans, like the

¹ Prussia contributes \$12,500,000 on her own account, and the empire generally the remainder, penurious Prussia thus paying twice over.

Americans, sought in protection a means, if only temporary, of building up their industries. Whether it will in every respect, and in the long run, yield all the results anticipated from it remains to be seen. Also, a new dramatic copyright treaty with England has secured protection for German authors which they have long lacked.

Bismarck once said that the fear of responsibility is one of the diseases of our time. This fear he certainly was not insensible to when he shared the responsibility with his sovereign of introducing, one by one, the well-known laws for the benefit of the working classes. He knew that the vested interests of the country, the landowners, and the well-to-do middle classes would never take the initiative, so he determined to do so himself. To many it is a dangerous doctrine to admit that social problems of the character in question can be solved by the state, and the attempt to do so will have to be judged by its results in the future. Still, it was a bold attempt, made in a noble spirit.

That the state cannot exercise the power it does in Germany without bringing disadvantages in its train is natural. Nor is it our aim to judge finally in how far the advantages outweigh the disadvantages; that can be shown by time alone. We only wish to point out that honest paternal government has done a deal of really good work, such as even a parliamentary majority might be proud of having accomplished. Who, one hundred and thirty years ago, seeing Frederick the Great return in triumph to his half-ruined and starving Berlin population after the Seven Years'

War, would have ventured to prophesy the future greatness of Prussia, which, after all, owes so much indirectly to those years of struggle and national suffering!

So also in our time there was something anomalous in seeing the state of siege proclaimed in the capital and other large towns; to know that the laws which govern the expression of political opinion are almost as severe as under a reactionary despotic government; to know that social democracy is feared, and subterraneously spreading and powerful. It is but permitted to hope and believe that the disadvantages may be temporary, while the advantages may be permanent. If these expectations be realized, the Germans can justly retort on the Manchester school: "Has it with you prevented the land drifting, year by year, into fewer hands? Has it not assisted to exterminate the small freeholders? Has it arrested the terrible depression of forty millions sterling in the annual value of English land? Has it been able to banish or lessen to any perceptible extent the squalor, dirt, and misery to be met with in every large town in the richest country of the world?"

To many it might well seem as if despotic laws were now and then as necessary in an over-civilized country as in a primitive one. It is obviously as absurd to say that force is no remedy as that unlimited liberty must necessarily be an unalloyed boon. The opinion of the majority is, after all, the expression of force—the will of the many.

SUMMARY

Forms of government are good or bad not so much inherently as in the way in which they are directed. The purity of its source is the first requisite of all good government. Race, climate, and geographical position are greater factors than is a chance constitution. In Germany a strong central government has been necessary for national existence. National sentiment has been weak; national consciousness has been wanting; individual genius has been the salvation of the country. Germany's greatness is recent, and the government has not been stable enough to permit free speech. The policy of the central authority has largely molded public opinion instead of being directed by it. While this paternal government has left to the state parliaments the enactment of local regulations, it has vigorously forwarded the national welfare. The army is admirably equipped and disciplined; officers are selected impartially; the smallest details receive careful attention; civil law has been codified, and is administered impartially; food products and medicines are rigorously inspected, and all means of public conveyance are brought to a high state of perfection.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. What two theories of government have been practiced by England and Germany respectively?
2. What is the first essential of good government?
3. How does geographical situation affect the conditions of government in different countries?
4. What three conditions are necessary to a sound public opinion?

5. Show how these have been lacking in Germany until recently.
6. Why did the Alsatians so readily lose their old ties ?
7. Why is there danger from government by public opinion in Germany ?
8. Why is freedom of speech restricted ?
9. Show how paternal government has been successful in conciliating both German and foreign states.
10. Show how it has cared for the welfare of the army.
11. For the health of the people.
12. What is the Bundesrath ?
13. What the Reichstag ?
14. Why was a new civil law code a necessity ?
15. What is true of the administration of law in Germany ?
16. How is the humanitarian interest of the government shown ?
17. What characteristics have the postal, express, and railway service ?
18. Are the railways owned by the state ?
19. What is true of the care of canals and roads ?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The State. Woodrow Wilson. Chapter VII, "The Governments of Germany."

Germany, Present and Past. S. Baring-Gould.

CHAPTER VI

BISMARCK

A great nation is a nation that produces great men.

—*Lord Beaconsfield.*

I

About a hundred years ago there lived a German author who wrote: "Oh, that we only possessed national pride and unity, and we should have been one nation, the first, the most powerful, in Europe. One nation! For that alone I wish I could come back again in a hundred years, to see my countrymen as a nation, or to hear of a German William Pitt."¹ If poor old Weber could come to life again, he would see much to rejoice over in his Fatherland; much that his honest old patriot's heart never dared to hope for; but, above all, he could still see Otto von Bismarck-Schönhausen Prince Bismarck, Germany's Iron Chancellor!²

Those who only admire this great man because the fates always turned the critical quarters of an hour of history in his favor do not understand or can hardly appreciate him. For in Bismarck's character, boldness, perspicacity, and dogged determination are allied to astute caution in a degree hardly equaled in his-

¹ Karl Julius Weber, "Democritos."

² The first edition of this book was published during Bismarck's lifetime, and this chapter has been left in the present edition without revision.

tory. These in their union give rise to a moderation in success equally remarkable.

For years we follow him, from his modest ancestral home to his entry into politics; everywhere the rough and sturdy Prussian squire, ready to break an opponent's head or to save a man from drowning; everywhere strong, demonstratively aggressive in his unbridled animal spirits. Here and there short glimpses of family affection relieve the picture of its harshness. A descendant of a hardy northern soldier family, he seems born out of his time; a paladin longing for the jousts of tournament, or for foray, or adventure by field or flood.

He steps into a position of responsibility, and gradually, very gradually, the strong wine passes through fermentation, and the old nature is as if clarified into a new character. "May it please God," he wrote to his wife (July 3, 1851), "to fill this vessel with strong and clear wine, now that the champagne of youth has effervesced uselessly and left stale dregs behind." Those who had known Bismarck only during these earlier years hardly recognized the man later on at the head of affairs. Called to the Frankfort Diet in 1851,¹ as the representative of Prussia, he was a square peg in a round hole for the condition of things as they then were.

In a letter to the prime minister of Prussia, dated July 5, 1851, Bismarck's predecessor in Frankfort, Herr von Rochow, tells the following respecting Bismarck's appointment as his successor, and the com-

¹ The various German states, including Austria, were loosely combined in a federation. The Diet was a representative body of delegates from the different states. Austria wielded the chief power.

ments of the then prince of Prussia on his visit to Frankfort:

The latter said, "And this lieutenant of the Landwehr is to be our ambassador at the Diet?" "Yes," I replied, "and I believe he is well chosen; Herr von Bismarck is spontaneous, energetic, and I believe he will come up to every expectation of your royal highness."

The prince had nothing to say in return, but in general he was favorably impressed with this excellent champion of right and true Prussian sentiments. I fancy his royal highness would have wished Herr von Bismarck might have been a little older, with gray hairs, but whether with these attributes it would be exactly possible to meet the expectations of his royal highness I hardly dare to say.

As yet he is but feeling his way—the possibilities of Prussia as a governing influence had not revealed themselves to him. The aristocratic leanings of Austria were indeed sympathetic to his *Junker*¹ nature, even though this same Austria lorded it over his own country.

At first we see only the militant nature—the fighting man, ready to resent hostility by retort or blow from whatever point of the compass it comes. The hauteur of the Austrian ambassador, Count Thun, the president of the Diet, receives its quietus incidentally,² while our hero is feeling his way and learning still to appraise facts fully. Gradually he awakens to the emptiness which underlies the Austrian pretensions. The man who since has hardly ever looked at an opponent without reading him through and through was not

¹ Term for Prussian squire.

² This refers to the well-known anecdote of Bismarck taking away the breath of the Austrian ambassador by quietly asking him for a light for his cigar at a time when none of the German representatives dared smoke before the president of the Diet.

long in forming his opinion of the Austrian representative. To those who wrote to him warning him of the political astuteness of his opponent, he replies, "My good folks, why he is a thoroughly stupid fellow!"

But he had yet to clarify and formulate his ideas, and to gain that statesmanlike view of affairs which enabled him to subordinate everything to his purpose. He saw himself recognized only as the representative of a second-rate power, and his strong nature rebelled at the position; but he bore the unpopularity of Prussia with a light heart, and even seemed to take pleasure in the feelings that he evoked.

A Count Isenburg, irate at some remark of Bismarck's, was said to be coming to Frankfort to thrash him. But those who knew Bismarck chuckled at the idea. He himself, hearing of Isenburg's murderous intentions, writes, "I cannot make out what I have done to the good man; I always took him for a harmless person."¹ It need hardly be said the irascible count thought the matter twice over.

The gossip of the period teems with illustrations of his bold action and boisterous language, the tenor of which openly revealed his political views and plans. Many of his frank, blunt opinions on high personages in those days are deeply instructive even now as showing with how little wisdom the world is ruled. For they have invariably proved to be incisive and true. During these years of petty bickering and enforced idleness the idea took possession of him that Austria must be turned out of Germany, and henceforth he became her death enemy.

¹ "Preussen im Bundestag," page 159. Leipzig, 1885.

The Italian war of 1859 broke out, and witnessed Austria's defeat. Public opinion in Germany strongly expressed itself in a wish to help Austria; but Bismarck, even before the war had begun, was already half inclined to take the opportunity to join hands with France in humbling her. As this wish, openly expressed, was in direct opposition to the views held in responsible quarters in Berlin, Bismarck was no longer the right person to represent the latter in Frankfort, and was transferred to Petersburg as Prussian ambassador, where he arrived in March, 1859.

There the reputation of his opposition to, and even hatred of, Austria had preceded him, and made him highly popular in Russian court circles, still smarting under the sense of the equivocal conduct of Austria during the Crimean War.

In the meantime, the Italian campaign had shown the hopeless divisions of the German Federal States in a stronger light than ever. The victory of France over Austria was the consequence of this helplessness, and caused a popular clamor for union to break out anew in Germany, particularly in the Liberal party. On September 15, 1859, the "National Union" was formed in Frankfort-on-the-Main, which included in its program the representation of the German people, and asked the central power in Germany to be conferred on Prussia.

But time sped on, while King William saw that the sword would need to be sharpened before anything could come of this. It was imperative to strengthen the army. Parliament refused to lend itself to a prolongation of the period of military service, as also to

the granting of the increased military budget; at least, unless the government would declare that it was prepared to use the increased armaments to secure national unity. In view of the jealousy of Austria and France, that concession was impossible. The king saw that a foreign minister who would have to unfold all his plans to a critical, inquisitive representative assembly must needs give up, or at least must delay, their fulfilment. The king, at the risk of losing his crown, determined to carry out his plans for the re-organization of the army against the opposition of the majority in Parliament, and to obtain the necessary funds and spend them without its consent. Thus arose a conflict between crown and Parliament. In carrying out this determination to face the opposition of the majority of his subjects, the king looked around for a ministry to stand by him. One by one they fell in this bloodless battle against numbers.

King William stood alone. In this dilemma he was advised to send for Herr von Bismarck, who had already gained the reputation of a bold and determined politician. Thus originated Bismarck's relationship to his sovereign, which lasted unbroken from 1862 till the death of the king.

II

The years of struggle with Parliament from 1862 to 1866 are matters of history, and they tell us that Bismarck showed the same courage and pertinacity as his royal master. History shows us with what dexterity during this period he hoodwinked his opponents, charming them, as it were, into a false sleep of security

from which they woke only to find the irrecoverable moment of action past. We learn how, during his short stay in Paris in 1862, he confided his plans to the emperor.¹ "He is mad," the latter said; and the empress thought him a funny fellow. The French ministers with one accord agreed that he was not by any means a man to be taken seriously into account.

The preliminary fight for the standard took place in 1864, when Austria joined Prussia in the campaign against Denmark, which ended in the cession to Germany of Schleswig-Holstein. It is again a matter of history how Bismarck and the king, still acting in opposition to the parliamentary majority of the country, twisted the division of the spoil into a rope that coiled itself around the throat of Austria on the field of Sadowa in 1866. We find Bismarck starting for Bohemia on the outbreak of this war, the object of universal hatred, if not of execration. He has told us himself that had Prussia lost he would have unfailingly committed suicide.

So far we see only the bold political gambler playing for a great stake. The victory won, he is suddenly revealed in a new character; for he who had been mainly instrumental in bringing this war about, in the moment of victory turns around and boldly opposes his royal master and his military advisers in their wish to despoil Austria. He himself has told us how, during the negotiations of Nickolsburg, he had to encounter such opposition that his nervous system was thoroughly unstrung. The man of iron threw himself on his bed and sobbed like a child.

¹ Napoleon III.

We have seen the political leader in the making; we will now take a glance at the man. First and foremost among his characteristics we note the rare power of rising at every crisis above his narrower self, and making the interests of his country supreme. The man who opposed the spoliation of Austria after Sadowa might well call out with Lord Clive, "I stand appalled at my own moderation." For it was not the fear of France, as some erroneously suppose, that dictated such wise moderation, but that prophetic instinct of his—that instinct which often leads genius to be stoned by one generation in order to be adored by posterity—that enabled him to see that a day was near when it would be policy to be friends with the present foe.

Austria had bitten the dust before—in fact, she must almost have become accustomed to it by force of habit—but the Austrians had never before been humbled by a foe who, within a generation of laming their arms, succeeded in gaining their hearts. Yet such is the present state of things in parts of Austria—where the hatred of Prussia prior to 1866 was most intense—that Emperor William and Prince Bismarck compete in popularity with her reigning house.

Such is the first result of the working out of this trait of sagacious magnanimity in a great object in Bismarck. Although he may not be able to say on his death-bed, with Richelieu, that he had never had any personal enemies, his only enemies having been the enemies of the state, he can point to even rarer characteristics. The subordination of his own strong passions has often taken a far higher form. If we can



From an original photograph taken at Friedrichshuh in 1893.

PRINCE BERNHARD, HIS WIFE, CHILDREN, AND GRANDCHILDREN, AND FERNACH AND HIS WIFE

picture him as Sylla, the Roman dictator, crushing his rivals ruthlessly, exterminating their adherents, we cannot quite credit him with that stoicism which enabled Sylla to bear in silence the opprobrious epithets of that young patrician who followed the ex-dictator, reviling him, through the streets of Rome. But our appreciation must increase in proportion the more we bear in mind his passionate temper, when we come to consider that no single instance is on record of Bismarck's ever allowing his strongest personal leanings, antipathies, or passions to influence seriously his action when the welfare of the state was in question.

III

The War of 1866 concluded, Bismarck returns to Berlin with the king, and takes share in the ovations of the people. He first seeks, side by side with his sovereign, the condonation of past breaches of the letter of the constitution, and the bill of indemnity is passed with acclamation by a Parliament delighted with national victory.¹

Now begins the new phase in his activity—the work of consolidating what had been gained—the strengthening of the North German Confederation, the conciliation of the popular assembly, and the smoothing of the way to a better understanding with the South.

At the beginning of this period falls that master-stroke of Bismarck's which was only revealed to the public and to France like a clap of thunder in 1867—

¹ The government in violation of the constitution had, in spite of the opposition of Parliament, carried out its policy of organizing and strengthening the army.

the secret treaty with the South.¹ The result of this would have been that even had the French tardily provoked war in 1866, they would have found Prussia at the head of all Germany, a fact they were loath to believe even in 1870, notwithstanding the previous publication of the treaty.

The years from 1866 to 1870, in their creative and consolidating fertility, belong to history; it suffices for our purpose that they were years of unremitting work and successful effort with Bismarck. Only once was their calm disturbed—by the Luxemburg quarrel in 1867, which would have led to war then had it not been for Bismarck's moderation. This, again, must be regarded as a striking instance of that self-control and moderation in success so conspicuous in Bismarck's character; doubly so, when we bear in mind that he already regarded war as inevitable.

The leading facts of the War of 1870 and the after-results of these unprecedented campaigns are too well known to require that we should dwell on them. It suffices for our purpose to point out that, onerous as were the conditions imposed on the vanquished in the eyes of the placid onlooker, it was notoriously the work of Bismarck that they were not far more so. Here, as in 1866, Bismarck was opposed by Moltke, of whom a most impartial French writer says, "Had Moltke had his way, France would have been annihilated." And let there be no mistake: there was nobody to stop the way; Austria was powerless, Russia passive, and the offers of England's interfer-

¹ That is, with the South German states—Bavaria, Würtemberg, and Baden.

ence had been coldly declined. The calm, dispassionate moderation of Bismarck in success, although perhaps hardly perceptible to our eyes, has yet been recognized as one of his striking characteristics, even by individual Frenchmen.

It is not our purpose to enter chronologically here into the details of his latter-day internal administration; we wish only to summarize.

The supreme position he gained for himself and helped to gain for his country has, since 1870, been utilized in the interests of peace, so that it has been well said that never before has such immense political power been used with such moderation. This is, perhaps, the brightest jewel in Bismarck's crown of glory, even if in justice we must admit that he only shares it with his late imperial master. This moral position led to what was perhaps, in one sense, the greatest triumph of his life, when, after the late Turco-Russian War, Europe seemed on the eve of a desperate struggle, and Russia and England met at Berlin, and sought the adjustment of their differences at the hands of the "honest broker."

Side by side with the unparalleled ovation on the part of all Germany which greeted Bismarck on the attainment of his eightieth birthday—April 1, 1895—we cannot resist the temptation of referring back to a letter the late Emperor William wrote to him in September, 1884, on the occasion of conferring on him the military insignia of the order "Pour le Mérite." For its spirit breathes the due recognition of services such as rarely have been rendered to a state by a subject, and is doubtless unique in history as the tribute

of a sovereign, who thus honored himself as much as him whom he distinguished:

Although the significance of this order is intended to be essentially military, still you ought to have had it long ago. For, in truth, you have shown the highest courage of the soldier in many hard times, and, besides, in two wars you have shown at my side that, besides all other distinctions, you have the fullest claim to a high military one. Thus I make up for omissions (*Versäumtes*) in sending you herewith the order "Pour le Mérite," with oak leaves (*Eichenlaub*) added, if only to express thereby that you ought to have had it before, and that you have deserved it again and again. I so fully appreciate in you the heart and mind of a soldier that I hope, in sending you this order, which many of your ancestors wore with pride, to give you pleasure. In doing so it affords me satisfaction to feel that I am thereby granting a deserved distinction as a soldier to the man whom God's gracious providence has placed by my side, and who has done so much for his country.

IV

Thus the people, who were so slow to recognize the man, had come to look upon everything that had occurred, good or bad, as directly foreseen by or emanating from him. Of course this is as far from being the case as the estimate of public opinion is ever far from being the verdict of history. No human being foresees every turn of the wheel of time; in nine cases out of ten even to the ken of genius it is the unforeseen that occurs. But great men meet the unexpected, while mediocrity is overtaken and crushed by it. Nor are Bismarck's great successes alone the most remarkable feature in the man. The way he has repeatedly turned an awkward occurrence to his advantage sup-

plies us with subject for admiration. When German colonial annexations caused an outburst of patriotism in Spain to defend her rights to the Caroline Islands, public opinion thought that at last Bismarck had got into trouble. But lo! he proposes the arbitration of the pope, and by that single move does more, without loss of dignity, to conciliate the Catholic world than a series of reactionary laws might have attained.

Uniformly successful abroad, he failed but once—namely, in his struggle with a foe of a thousand years, the power of Rome. And yet even here, although he failed to conquer, neither was it a defeat; concessions were made on both sides. Here he failed because success was hardly possible. Yet just this failure supplies us with a forcible illustration of a great trait in the man. After being identified for years with open antagonism to the papal see, it must have cost his pride no trifling pang to step out lustily on the road to Canossa¹—he, a stanch Protestant—smoking the pipe of peace with the placidity of an honest purpose.

After leaning for years for support on the best intellect of Germany, after being hailed as the torch-bearer of the modern spirit of enlightenment against the temporal pretensions of medieval papacy, it cannot have been with a light heart that he threw in his lot with many elements of superstition and class prejudice. But those elements meant support against the wild dream of anarchic socialism, against the petty

¹ This refers to the struggle between Pope Gregory VII. and Henry IV., emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. It was a contest between church and state, in which the pope finally compelled the emperor to sue for mercy. Henry sought the pope at the castle of Canossa. Hence one who tries to conciliate the Vatican is said to "take the road to Canossa."

spirit of *Particularismus*,¹ which is not dead even up to the present day.

If personal ambition—a word that reads so close to egregious vanity—had been his motive power, is it to be supposed that a passionate, vindictive nature like Bismarck's would have taken such a step? History is only too rich in instances to show how much easier it is for ambitious natures to be "consistent" in their self-willed aims than to turn back in the face of friend and foe and boldly cry out: "I was wrong; I underrated the power of the spirits I raised too readily. I must retrace my steps."

Now, although Cicero long ago warned his compatriots that no liberal man should impute a charge of unsteadiness to another for having changed his opinion,² that dreadful German pedantic fad, *Überzeugungstreue* (fidelity to conviction), has laid hold of Bismarck on the score of his changed opinions, and reproached him with it. He has been accused of his former leanings toward Austria, of his conversion to protection, besides his change of front toward the Vatican. Well did he retort to such charges, that he thought he had therein the advantage over those who still remained where they were a generation ago. And this must seem well founded to all those who do not share the belief of the supernatural prescience of statesmen, but rather see their genius in the capacity of profiting by experience and of turning the unforeseen to their advantage.

¹ A German expression denoting the individual interest of each separate state.

² Our own statesmen—Lord Beaconsfield, Mr. Gladstone, and Lord Derby—supply striking instances of changing convictions.

Napoleon, who wrote to his brother Joseph, king of Spain, "I know I shall find the Pillars of Hercules in Spain, but not the limits of my power," would have come down to posterity a far greater man if bitter experience had taught him to recant in time, and that the limits of his power were confined to somewhere about the Rhine. Has history dealt kindly with him because the warnings providence sent were lost on him? Has history not denied him the adjective of "Great," notwithstanding his "consistency" in refusing to see the chances within his reach, of rising above his ambitious self, and of profiting in time by the dreadful lessons of his aberrations?

Herein is to be found the main difference between the intellectual power as well as the ambition of a Napoleon and that of a Bismarck—namely, in the difference in meaning of the latter word. To many, Bismarck is the very archetype of an ambitious nature; and so he may be, only with the proviso which his enemies forget—namely, that there is such a thing as an almost divine ambition. After all, what is the potentiality of all earthly ambition compared to the one ambitious hope most of us confess to and earnestly strive to realize—that of a happier future hereafter? Bearing the latter ambition in mind, how can we ride roughshod over the definition of ambition, and qualify it as a questionable quality? To some, the will to serve one's country at the risk or certainty of unhappiness in this world may seem as worthy as the ambition that prompts us to be anxious for our personal welfare hereafter.

If there is such a thing as a noble ambition to serve

one's country, surely that quality in its highest acceptation is to be found in Bismarck. And, as far as we can judge, we may even qualify his desire to serve his country as one that has its origin in the rights of man; the right to exist as an independent country, free to develop its institutions in peace. For the idea of serving his country by despoiling alien races, which has been the excuse of so many victorious conquerors, has never been one that found favor in his eyes. Without, perhaps, being one of those fanatical believers in the gospel of nationalities—for he is far too clear-sighted to be a blind believer in any set doctrine—it is well known that he regretted the military necessity of annexing purely French territory in 1870. All his previous conquests have been limited to territory to which the empire of Germany was legitimately entitled by ties of race and historical traditions. We have only to gauge the extent of the German military successes by historical comparisons in order to become convinced of the clear-headed, sagacious moderation of the man in the midst of world-striking success. It is interesting to note how fortune favors those who have not exhausted her kindness, and how she totally forsakes those who have once abused her. This is strikingly illustrated by the careers of Napoleon I. and Bismarck. The peculiarity of the latter is that he has lived to prove that he deserved the smiles fortune reserved for him.

It seems but natural to turn to history for comparisons, and few characters offer so tempting a subject for drawing parallels as that of Bismarck. For everything about the man is definite and powerfully

outlined, down to the exact number of his hirsutory adornments, the popularly accepted three hairs, no more nor less. And this is, in its way, symptomatic. Nothing is too trifling for his individual attention, and he brings the same amount of dogged determination to bear on his efforts to protect the obscure German trader in East Africa as if a great interest were at stake.

To our mind the character in English history which personally offers most affinity to him is that of Lord Clive. The story of Clive's boyhood is such as we could fancy Bismarck's. And if the child be the father to the man, Bismarck, again, in his schoolboy days, sitting among the branches of a tree and declaiming the Iliad to his schoolfellows, reminds us of Clive. Bismarck's youthful predilection for Ajax Telamon among all Homeric heroes seems to strike a common key in the two men's characters—the hearty fighter, less intent on playing a leading part than in giving play to the unbounded animal spirits of strife for its own sake, but withal honest and trustworthy, if somewhat rough. In daring allied to cunning, again, they resemble each other, though it was only in their maturity that they were called upon to play the Homeric part of Ulysses. The history of Clive's manipulation of Surajah Dowlah and the doubtful treaty with Omi-chund offers some resemblance to Bismarck's hoodwinking of Napoleon III. and his diplomatic agents.

Clive's marriage and the close ties of intellectual sympathy that bound him to Lady Clive during his whole life again present many points of resemblance with what we know of Bismarck. And lastly, the

judgment of popular opinion, if not analogous in both cases, is at least curiously suggestive.

The following description of Bismarck's personal appearance is interesting as coming from the pen of a Frenchman:

The outward aspect alone of the man denotes something out of the common; the round face has something of the bulldog: the broad bald forehead; the deep-seated eyes beneath thick brows, with their impenetrable depth of expression; the sardonic mouth, badly hidden beneath the moustache; enormous ears, as if to catch every sound; the broad chin—everything gives the idea of power and brutality. He is colossal. I have seen him on horseback in the white uniform of the Magdeburg Cuirassiers; I seemed to see one of the mythical sons of Haimon.

V

Bismarck is a stanch believer in the monarchical principle, and is thoroughly German in his anxiety to guard the privileges of the crown. In fact, his character as a whole, exceptional as it is, is in many respects distinctly typical of his country, even down to his bursts of irritability. His deference to the crown is the result of honest conviction, for there is not an ounce of the courtier or self-seeking opportunity hunter in his composition. The stubborn honesty of his nature excludes all possibility of such qualities. With the courage of one who knows not the meaning of fear, instead of blinding himself to the demands of the Social Democrats, while combating them, he has yet tried to gain for himself the knowledge of what is practicable in their demands; and out of it we see the system of insurance against sickness, in case of acci-

dent, and, lastly, the project of pensions in old age, come one after the other for the benefit of the working classes.

He has tried hard to stimulate the manufacturing classes of the country, and rightly or wrongly, he sought the assistance of protection for that purpose. His aim was plain—to make his country independent of foreign manufacturers, and to force others to accept German products. His colonial policy, whether successful or not in the future, has at least already had the one result of giving an enormous moral impetus to the trade of the country.

While party government shows everywhere a craven anxiety to employ only its own partisans—as if position were a reward of the nature of a bribe—Bismarck has sought coöperation among every shade of opinion down to that of formerly ostracized Republicans. He himself has put it: “I welcome coöperation gratefully from every side, and ask not what party it comes from.”

This, however, from no mere accommodation to self-interest. Every action of his was intended to kindle the national spirit, and in this conciliation was but a means to an end. Thus, if Bismarck is in part responsible for a certain boisterous self-assertion in the academical youth of Germany, the increase of students' pugnacity, etc., it must be taken in this light. Also his well-known refusal to receive a German book printed in Roman characters, which well might seem surprising to us in its pettiness if judged from a personal point of view, was doubtless part of a well-weighed system of national propaganda. As he

has never disdained to avail himself of the smallest advantage in foreign politics, so also no means are too trifling to gain the end in view nearer home, for the end justifies them.

But narrow natures—political faddists—who ride about on the broomsticks of ragged principles, would fain judge Bismarck according to their intolerant standards, while recommending their own methods as to how to raise a people out of the political mud of the past. His opponents have not shown that they possess the magnanimity they pretend to find lacking in him. There has been too much wounded vanity turned to hate.

Much of the opposition Bismarck ever encountered in his home policy may be traced to the spirit of jealousy felt by advocates of social reform because they were not allowed to carry out their own measures—a feature of parliamentary government in all countries. Many also have been too sensitively anxious to show that they were not led captive by the glamour of military success, and in some notable instances this feeling has been the result of excessive vanity. The average Germans have acute perception, and yet they have never been appreciators of a great man. A sort of self-consciousness makes them loath to surrender their judgment to unqualified admiration for home genius. Goethe, Schiller, and other great Germans knew something of this; and Bismarck himself has spoken sarcastically on this subject, as referred to elsewhere.

Thus, although long all-powerful, he has been the subject of venomous hatred in his own country; and this hatred, it must be admitted, he has given back in current coin. It was perhaps only natural in an age

that loves to make itself believe everything can be done in kid gloves, that Bismarck's remark to Count Beust, that when once we get our enemy in our power it is our duty to crush him, should have caused surprise to some and horrified others. (This animus does not seem to nullify another saying of his, that we ought to be outwardly polite to our enemies even to the steps of the scaffold!)

The memorable conflict between Bismarck and Count Arnim is a case in point. He pursued the count even to the jaws of death, and there can be no doubt that the punishment of Arnim seems to some to have been out of all proportion to his guilt. But we must remember that behind Arnim stood the violent hatred of an entire clique, whom Bismarck struck at in their leader. This was well known at the time, for the emperor declared himself powerless to save Arnim from the hatred of the chancellor. Yet even here it is necessary to bear in mind that, let Bismarck's resentment against Count Arnim have been never so violent, this in itself was insufficient to secure the latter's legal condemnation and punishment in Germany. These were impartially meted out to Count Arnim by the legal tribunal of the land, which on a later occasion—that of the prosecution of Professor Geffcken by Bismarck—clearly demonstrated its independence by acquitting the accused.

There are battles in political life in which the price of defeat in some countries must be annihilation. That Bismarck is a good hater—enough so to delight the heart of Dr. Johnson—he has abundantly proved; and that his nervous irritability—his impatience of oppo-

sition—largely increased as he grew older is generally understood. That he allowed himself to be carried away by the opposition of his enemies, even to impugn their motives without sufficient cause, notably in the debate on the tobacco monopoly, will hardly be denied. Yet even here Bismarck never allowed personal pique to sway his acts when his sense of duty was called into play.

For all that, we do not believe that a wound to his self-esteem alone could ever have led Bismarck to show personal animus in a political matter. There are plenty of incidents known when he rose superior to it, among them the following:

Count d'Hérissou, an officer of the French general staff, tells us in his book, "Journal of an Artillery Officer," how he was sent to Versailles to deliver to Prince Bismarck the document signed by the French government embodying the capitulation of Paris. On the road thither he conceived the bold idea of endeavoring, on his own account, to obtain the release from one onerous condition of the capitulation—namely, the surrender of the flags of the Paris garrison. He therefore told Bismarck that he had brought the document ready signed, but with instructions only to deliver it up if the Germans would relinquish their claim to the French flags. At first Bismarck was very irritated and excited, but gave in at last; thus Count d'Hérissou's stratagem was successful. When his book appeared, this passage was met with strong doubts by the public. But it turned out to be perfectly true, for Bismarck caused a letter to be written to Count d'Hérissou telling him that he had read his book with great interest, and he complimented Count d'Hérissou on the patri-

otic victory he had gained over him. In this, as in many other instances, Bismarck has shown a generosity of feeling toward foreign foes that he has rarely shown to opponents of his own nationality.

VI

Even Bismarck's deficiencies are interesting, and often arouse our sympathies. At a time when many statesmen divide their energies between the task of ruling and horse-racing, the collecting of old china, casuistic discussion, and other pastimes, it is almost refreshing to find a man who honestly tells you that he understands nothing of the old masters, that he is too old to learn to appreciate "high art," that he does not know the inside of an opera house or of a concert hall, and that he prefers an Italian organ-grinder to a remarkable tenor.

Bismarck's dislike of the press is well known, but is not surprising when we bear in mind how he has been treated by his pen-wielding enemies during the greater part of his political career. How often during his tenure of office public opinion expressed through the press announced his approaching decline, only to see him rise through each succeeding crisis higher and higher in influence and power. But strong characters, such as his, are not so likely to be appreciated by those of whom Spenser says:

Therefore the vulgar did about him flocke,
And cluster thicke unto his leasings vaine
(Like foolish Flies about an Honey crocke),
In hope by him great benefite to gaine,
And uncontrolled Freedome to obtaine.

Also, Bismarck has been denied the dangerous gift of oratory, of which its detractors say, with some reason, that it has done more harm than good in the world. Orators have rarely been statesmen. Curiously enough, too, history teaches us that most great orators have appeared coeval with a nation's decay: witness, Demosthenes and Cicero. Also the thunderbolts that the late M. Gambetta hurled from his jaws only served to reëcho the cry of a defeated country! Neither Richelieu nor Cromwell nor Washington was an orator, yet history does not tell us that their statesmanship suffered from the lack of this accomplishment. Bismarck's is not a nature we can imagine delivering well-turned periods or emitting polished Ciceronic shafts. But if his periods are nervously jagged and lack rotundity, they fly as straight as a dart, and, where they strike, they pierce the enemy through and through, and thence pursue their winged course right across the country.

The question of Bismarck's reported dislike of England and the English has been too often mooted not to warrant a passing reference. If we may draw our conclusions from many references to England in his private correspondence, from the fact of both his sons receiving English baptismal names (Herbert and William¹), as also from the many opportunities the writer has been privileged to enjoy of conversing with Prince Bismarck of late years, we should say that, next to Germany, there is no country and no people he originally felt so much sympathy with as England and the English. On the other hand, there are some

¹ He is called "Bill" in the family circle.

who aver that the continual upholding of English doctrines and methods he has had to encounter in Parliament, not to mention certain occult English influences constantly brought up in even higher places to counteract his plans, have had their share in prejudicing him against England. That Bismarck is only too happy if he comes in contact with a representative of England who is congenial to him is abundantly proved by his studied attention and courtesy to Lord Beaconsfield¹ during the Berlin Congress.

To many it may come as a surprise when we say that Bismarck's nature is in its root essentially religious. The categorical imperative of Kant is by him translated into a dominating influence, and in the light of his own private confession we must regard him as drawing his strength and foresight from the constant sense of dependence on a higher will which has called him to his place at the head of the German people. For instance, we find this frank and almost brusque statesman thus writing in the autumn of 1870, while the victories of the war were yet fresh:

If I were not a Christian, I would not serve my king another hour. If I did not obey my God and put my trust in Him, my respect for earthly rulers would be but small. I have enough to live upon, and, as a private man, I should enjoy as much consideration as I desire. Why, then, should I exhaust myself with unwearying labor in this world, why expose myself to difficulties, unpleasantness, and ill-treatment, if I had not the feeling that I must do my duty before God and for His sake? If I did not believe in a divine government of the world which

¹ It may be interesting to English readers to remember that Lord Beaconsfield—at all times a great judge of character—was one of the few who were impressed with Bismarck's frank statement of his ambitious aims in 1862, and anticipated their fulfilment.

had predestined the German nation to something great and good, I would abandon the trade of diplomacy at once, or, rather, I should never have undertaken it. I do not know whence my sense of duty should come, except from God. Titles and decorations have no charm for me. The confident belief in life after death—that is it—that is why I am a Royalist; without it, I should by nature be a Republican. All the steadfastness with which I have for ten years resisted every conceivable absurdity has been derived only from my resolute faith. Take this faith from me, and you take my country too. . . . How willingly would I leave it all! I am fond of country life, of the fields and the woods. Take away from me my belief in my personal relation to God, and I am the man to pack up my things to-morrow, to escape to Varzin, and look after my crops!

To us these words bear the impress of deep sincerity. They are clear water welling down the old gray rock, fresh, sweet, pure, and beautiful, round whose course as it flows fragrant flowers may grow, making the hard, harsh outline soft and radiant.

VII

It is indeed no easy matter to gain a clear, unbiased estimate of the gigantic personality of Prince Bismarck. To a contemporary it is nearly impossible. It is as if we stood before an imposing Alpine landscape, near enough to perceive the rifts in the rocky structure, but not far enough away to appreciate the majestic beauty of the outlines and the harmony of color of the whole. If this be true of his contemporaries, how much more so must it be the case with those who stand nearest to him—his own countrymen. The aspect is blurred by the many points of attack of

his political opponents. But one fact stands out preëminent amid the chaos of criticism, hatred, and admiration, namely, that since 1870 the many years of Prince Bismarck's political preponderance meant peace in Europe and increasing prosperity in Germany.

And now that this Titanic figure of our century has retired into the seclusion of private life—to live on and to witness still the stability of his work outlast the period of his own personal direction—who can say that the fitful glimpses we get of his mighty individuality contradict the essentially harmonious human estimate we have formed of his character? The cry of anguish, "I cannot lie down like a hibernating bear," does not lead us into temptation to quibble and sling arrows at the human weakness of a man whose foibles are sometimes fraught with more greatness than the life achievements of many a popular hero.

Bismarck has never assumed the placidity of the stoic. As we ventured to point out, when still in the height of his power, we do not seek his counterpart in the stoicism of the Roman dictator. His heart, his blunt honesty, his instincts, were ever German to the core. In order to accomplish his work it was as imperative that they should have been so as it was that Martin Luther should have been able to throw his mighty German individuality in the scale against the cunning of the priesthood of Rome. Even genius cannot mark the records of a people for all time, unless its inspiration is fraught with the fragrance of the soil of its birth. Thus the heart-burnings of this great man only bring him nearer to us from the human nature of their source.

It has been well said that no one can know the utter contemptibility of human nature like a fallen minister. But even others need but have studied the past in order to have expected the howl of triumph of his enemies which followed the fall of this great man. Are we not even told that the death of Frederick the Great—the policeman of Europe—was greeted with a sigh of relief by the community at large? And yet who heeds old Frederick's detractors to-day, while the luster of his deeds is more resplendent now than at the time of their execution. Thus it is ever the fate of truly great men; they gain by the perspective succeeding ages lend to their contemplation. Still, even Bismarck's fall fortunately affords, now that he is still living, an opportunity of qualifying a pessimistic estimate of mankind in general.

There was a glorious ray of human sunshine in that manifestation of sympathy when the grand old paladin left Berlin, amid the beautiful German cry, "Auf Wiedersehen."¹ It does us good to hear of mothers holding up their children to catch another glimpse of those mighty features. This is a privilege enjoyed by many thousand patriots since, who from time to time have made their pilgrimage to Friedrichsruh in the hope of seeing once more Germany's Iron Chancellor in his rural retreat—retired from business, but still living on lustily in the hearts of his countrymen.

It is not for us—in fact it is too early for any man—to presume to judge of what is hidden from our gaze and ken. The details of internal politics of a great foreign country may call forth our interest, but they

¹ "Until we meet again."

are, at least for the time being, beyond the scope of our judgment. However, time need not roll on in order to enable us to feel that no incident with which we are acquainted can detract from our estimate of the genuine human nature underlying the vast genius of Germany's greatest statesman.

SUMMARY

Prince Bismarck was born of a northern soldier family, and first came into prominence at Frankfort as a member of the Diet of German states. Here he met with the unpopularity then accorded Prussia, and recognizing that Austria must be turned out of Germany, began to work steadily toward that end. After the defeat of Austria by France in 1859, the German states formed the National Union at Frankfort, and asked that the central power of Germany be conferred upon Prussia. To secure this leadership a reorganization of the army, with consequent demands upon Parliament for money, was imperative. Successive ministers fell in the struggle till Bismarck allied himself with the emperor, and measures were carried through in the face of opposition. He urged the successful Seven Weeks' War against Austria, strengthened the North German Confederation, and formed the secret treaty with the South. His treatment of France after her defeat in the War of 1870 is a striking example of moderation. The meeting of the Congress of Berlin in 1878 was a tribute to his honesty of purpose.

Bismarck's sagacity enabled him to turn every cir-

cumstance to account. He failed only in his contest with the Roman Church. His willingness to adapt means to ends sometimes caused him to be charged with inconstancy. But throughout all his work, his ambition to unite Germany was supreme. He tried to secure the coöperation of all parties and to foster the national spirit. Much of the opposition to him arose from jealousy of his great power, or from hatred and from statements made in the heat of debate. He was in many respects a typical German, essentially religious in his nature, and ready to subordinate merely personal interests to his supreme duty, that of building a nation.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. What marked traits of character did Bismarck show in his earlier years?
2. How did he rate the power of Austria?
3. What was the result of the Italian war of 1859?
4. What brought about Bismarck's alliance with King William?
5. How was his diplomatic skill shown in the years from 1862-1866?
6. How far did he subordinate his personal interests to those of the state?
7. What master-stroke of his became known to France in 1867?
8. How was his moderation again shown in the War of 1870?
9. How was the Berlin Congress a recognition of his moral worth?
10. What was Emperor William's tribute to him?
11. How was his sagacity shown in awkward situations?
12. How did his character show itself in his defeat by the pope?

13. Compare Bismarck's ambition with that of Napoleon.
14. Describe his personal appearance.
15. How did he deal with industrial problems?
16. How did he treat those who opposed him?
17. What was his attitude toward England?
18. How did he express his views of God and duty?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Prince Bismarck. Charles Lowe.

Bismarck. Some Secret Pages of His History. Busch.

Bismarck in the Franco-German War. Busch.

Bismarck, the Man and the Statesman. (Autobiography.)

See also bibliographies following Chapters I and IV.

CHAPTER VII

THE ARMY

Nullus mortalium armis aut fide ante Germanos esse.¹

—Tacitus.

I

Victory has given the German army a unique position in the eyes of the world. There is no denying that its composition and characteristics excite an interest the extent of which can only be compared to its achievements.

If a great standing army be a grim, unavoidable evil, at least it can be said of the German army that its end justifies the means that called it into existence. It is an army of peace. It is a nation in arms to secure peace. Its moral standing is by far the highest of any army the world has yet seen. Armies are too often sources of immorality and rowdyism in all times and countries, but this one is a decided agent of discipline and morality. The habits of punctuality, of obedience, of discipline, the inculcation of the instincts of honor in the humblest, the meeting of all classes in the nation on one common ground of feeling and duty, have physically and morally strengthened the whole German people. This fact is visible to the naked eye of any observant traveler who crosses the German frontier at

¹ None surpass the Germans in war and faithfulness.

different points, and compares the populations of the different countries.

We English, who are proverbially slow to recognize or to acknowledge foreign prowess—and not without some excuse, for we have plenty of our own to look back upon—we even have come to look upon the German army as something to be admired. “The sternest man-slaying system since the days of Sparta,” one of our most able periodicals termed it. Even a Frenchman could not help saying that although the German soldiers could not, “of course,” compare with the French, still there was no denying the merit of the German officers! “I have seen them driving their men forward with sword-blows,” he said. But not alone Frenchmen; it has often seemed to Englishmen that the victories of the Germans have failed to impress many others with the idea of their individual prowess. When we say individual prowess, we mean that glamour of individual valor and dash in the rank and file that has ever had a touch of romance to the eyes of the crowd.

If failure to impress in this way be a fact, and one that was based on accurate observation, then indeed the qualities of supreme animal courage are not answerable for the superiority of the Germans in the field; qualities which John Bright once told us can be bought to any extent in the world’s market at ten dollars a week.

It is well to dwell on this fact, and to endeavor to draw from it the only legitimate inferences that present themselves—namely, that Germany owed her success in the field to far higher qualities than those which of

old weighed down the scales in the victor's favor. Although some nations are still infected with Homeric traditions of vainglorious martial prowess, the days of the professional hero are gone forever. The old type, that ever utilized a portion of its energies to vilify and diminish an antagonist, has yielded to a better model. To-day the peasant, the plain citizen, takes his place in the ranks, and, steeled in the ordeal of battle, returns as a true type of a hero: a man who has quietly and unostentatiously done his duty.

It is significant that you will never hear mention of a brave officer in Germany. We constantly hear of "ein tapferer Soldat," a brave soldier, but we fear the Germans might look upon the term a "gallant officer," to which we are so accustomed, as slightly tautological—not to say savoring of platitude and vulgarity. They realize a dutiful officer, the other is assumed as a matter of course. A German member of the Reichstag referring to an officer as the "gallant member," as is the custom in England, would be laughed out of countenance.

Bismarck boasted, in his speech of February 6, 1888, that the Germans fear nobody but God. If we might be pardoned for differing from him in this particular instance, we would venture to say that the average German fears even a current of fresh air, which he calls a draft, more than anybody else in Europe. Unlike the French, who are intoxicated by martial glory, if he does not fear fighting, at least it has no charms for him; he dislikes it. But the strength of the Germans lies in the fact that at the call of duty they overcome their antipathy, and stand—a nation in

arms—ready to meet those who have put them to the trouble of doing so.

The German army is not meant to produce pugnacious heroes; it has a higher aim, for it succeeds in even training the coward to overcome his timidity and to do his duty. And what this “doing his duty” means, even the enemy occasionally bears witness to. Thus Count d’Hérisson¹ draws the following picture of an episode of the battle of Villiers Champigny:

The Germans, who were truly splendid under fire, advanced in dark masses, and at the moment of debouching in loose sharpshooter formation suddenly, as one man, lifted their muskets above their heads amid a deafening “hurrah.” This seemed to magnify their ranks as if by some pantomimic circus effect. Our mobile guards, who had never seen anything similar, were cowed.

But if the popular idea of heroism is rather scouted than valued in the German army, on the other hand, in no army is the spirit of true chivalry more cultivated than there. It was consistent with the best Prussian traditions that when French public opinion sought a scapegoat in Marshal Bazaine, his antagonist in war (Prince Frederick Charles), a royal prince and doughty soldier, offered to testify to his worth.

During the battle of Sadowa a company of the Second Prussian Foot Guards stood to the right of the village of Rosberitz. A regiment of Austrian cuirassiers advances at full charge. Captain von Görne orders his men to let them come on within two hundred yards. A well-aimed volley! Saddles are emptied, the horses fall. Fresh reserves rush forward in

¹ D’Hérisson, “Journal of an Artillery Officer” (Paris), page 280.

quick succession only to bite the dust before the unerring aim of the Prussians. A pile of wounded horsemen and horses covers the ground. Suddenly a single cuirassier jumps up, runs toward the Prussian lines, and, vaulting into the saddle of a stray charger, tries to regain his comrades. "Let nobody fire at that man," the Prussian captain calls out in a voice of thunder, and a mighty "Bravo" from the Prussian ranks reëchoes in answer after the flying horseman.

Even in peaceful incidents this chivalric sentiment now and then manifests itself. An instance may be found in the recent impressive ceremony of transferment of the body of the French general Carnot from Magdeburg to France.

In the inculcation of chivalry and the higher forms of the fulfilment of duty, the Prussian authorities are not merely content with precept drawn from the deeds of their own countrymen, but have long cultivated a cosmopolitan spirit of appreciating such wherever found. Thus when the well-known harrowing disaster occurred of the foundering of the English troop-ship the *Birkenhead*,¹ the splendid instance of discipline evinced on that occasion by the English troops on board was singled out by the king of Prussia and the account of it ordered to be read out aloud to every Prussian regiment in parade as a shining example worthy of emulation of the noblest fulfilment of duty.

¹The royal troop-ship *Birkenhead* foundered off the south coast of Africa in February, 1852, with the Seventy-fourth Highlanders commanded by Colonel Seton on board.

II

With the vast improvements in our time in firearms generally, other instincts must be called upon to face the shock of battle; not, perhaps, opposite instincts, but certainly qualities of a higher order than hitherto required. The soldiers who of old would show the wild beast roused within them in the heat and excitement of a hard-fought, hand-to-hand grapple might not be equally ready to stand at ease quietly for hours while the pitiless "ping" of bullets—fired at a range of one thousand yards—dealt death and devastation in their sullen lines. Troops in days gone by were seldom called upon to make forced marches to the degree that is often called for in the present day; nor were human beings ever expected to lie down and sleep on the bare fields for weeks together, and that mostly in the pouring rain, as was the case in 1870 from Weissenburg to Gravelotte and then on to Sedan. Animal courage alone, however high, can never hope to meet such requirements as are now asked of the rank and file of a great European army in the field. That readiness in getting killed is not the only quality required is shown by the fact that thirty-six German cavalry regiments did not lose a single man during the whole campaign of 1870! The Sixth Army Corps was hardly under fire at all.

Besides perfect organization, it was the lofty spirit—the stern sense of duty—which alone, under leaders of consummate genius, made those victories possible. And these leaders, in their turn, were nothing else but the outcome and result of that supreme sense of

conscientiousness and duty which is the one keynote of the whole organization of Prussia, civil and military. This trait is striking, from highest to humblest—from the king, who declared himself ready for duty, down to the humblest Pomeranian peasant, who, at the trumpet-call of war, quietly reported himself at the nearest place of enrolment and exchanged the hoe for the musket. This trait is visible everywhere in those iron hoops of the German army, the sergeants and non-commissioned officers. It reaches, perhaps, its most pregnant significance in the full captain, the company leader. The young lieutenant, often an easy-going fop, is invariably a changed man when entrusted with the responsibility of a captain's duty.

If Danton truly characterized "audacity," again and again "audacity," as the watchword of successful revolution, we might with equal justice define "duty," "duty" again and again, as the keynote, the rallying-point, of Prussia's success in the field. This feeling is even unassisted by the traditional "contempt" for an enemy which has ever been inculcated in the breast of the common soldier elsewhere. This undervaluing of the enemy has been supposed to increase the moral strength of an army, although history does not show that it ever prevented a defeat turning into a rout. The Prussians, both officers and men, are intuitively taught to overrate an enemy. Both in 1866 and 1870 the prevailing opinions were of the superiority of the Austrian cavalry, of the French infantry, etc. The soldiers themselves used to make these assertions dispassionately, but with a strongly expressed reservation that, notwithstanding probable first defeats, they hoped

to win in the end. The true value of this sobriety of spirit could, however, only have been fully demonstrated by temporary defeat—in an involuntary defensive position—and we feel sure that the nation which, above all others in Europe, individually hates war and bloodshed would have shown to advantage under such adverse conditions. For this steadiness in adversity is more readily found in troops which respect their enemies than in those that despise their foe and may have to overcome the disenchantment of finding out their mistake suddenly, and possibly too late.

III

The Bohemian campaign of 1866 brought one Prussian name prominently to the front—that of General Steinmetz, the lion of Nachod. He was a splendid example of that type of stubborn soldier ready to sacrifice any number of his men in his dogged determination to rout the foe. This type of soldier has been common to all times and countries. The Prussian army had seen no active service worth mentioning for generations, and a man of General Steinmetz's mold was well adapted to help it over the first squeamishness in tasting blood. Therefore it was but natural that this rugged soldier of the Blücher school (if it be fair to compare him to so modest a character as old Marshal "Vorwärts") should have come out of the Bohemian campaign to find his name a household word at home. In any other country we should have had that frail female commonly called "public opinion" pointing to General Steinmetz as the man to lead

supreme in future struggles. Not so in Prussia. A higher standard than that of public opinion directed and watched over the destinies of Germany. General Steinmetz's achievements were recognized and rewarded as they deserved to be, but not beyond their deserts. When, in 1870, a nation in arms crossed the Rhine to the strains of "Die Wacht am Rhein," it found General Steinmetz in command of the First Army. He was not a man to wait long for orders when an enemy was in sight. He stormed the heights of Spicheren and achieved a brilliant victory, though at the price of a terrible loss of life. But the workmanship that was good enough in 1866 was no longer to be tolerated in 1870. General Steinmetz had attacked without, if not against, orders, and, although victorious, had disconcerted the plans of his superiors, which, if properly carried out, were intended to cut off the army he had beaten at such heavy cost.

In any other country "public opinion" would have lifted the victorious general into her lap, and he would have been on the high road to further honors and rewards. Not so in Prussia; General Steinmetz was commanded to appear before the Red Prince and hear his fate. "Your excellency, although an old soldier, has presumably forgotten what it is to obey!" Words which, translated into their subsequent meaning, conveyed the order to go home at once, stripped of his command, in disgrace: "Cassio, I love thee; but never more be officer of mine."

At the battle of Le Bourget (before Paris), October 30, 1870, the storming column, consisting of the Queen Elizabeth regiment, the first battalion of the regiment

Queen Augusta, and the second company of the pioneers of the Guard, was led by Colonel Count Kanitz. It was exposed to a murderous fire while the pioneers had to work their way gradually through every obstacle in their path. The second battalion of the Elizabeth regiment advances with flying colors, when its standard-bearer falls; another non-commissioned officer seizes the standard, but he, too, is struck down. At that moment General von Budritzki dismounts, seizes the flag, and rushes on in advance of his grenadiers. Around him fall in quick succession Colonel von Zaluskowski, the commander of the Elizabeth regiment, and Count Waldersee, who had rejoined the army only a few days before, cured of the wound he had received at Gravelotte. The papers were full of this deed of valor of General von Budritzki, but in spite of it he was not promoted to an independent command. Heroism is not enough in Prussia to be entrusted with the welfare of a Prussian army corps.

It is even reported that, although General Herwarth von Bittenfeld commanded the vanguard column in 1866, Moltke refused to grant him a corresponding command in 1870, notwithstanding the repeatedly expressed wish of the king himself, with whom he was an especial favorite.

A Prussian officer does not hold a responsible command because of his bravery, but because of his supposed *talent for the disposition* of troops (*Dispositions-talent*), his capacity to take the initiative, to act with judgment under unforeseen conditions—in short, his fitness for command.

These incidents are instructive as showing how heroes, however exalted, who disobey orders, or who—even far less—are judged incompetent, although in appearance successful, are dealt with by the competent directing minds in the German army. So little, however, are these facts understood by public opinion in other countries, that after the retirement of the late Prince Alexander of Battenberg from Bulgaria some of its exponents busied themselves with his probable nomination to the command of a Prussian army corps.

IV

Neither the efficiency of the German army nor the choice of its leaders depends on the watchfulness of public opinion—it is perfectly independent of it; and this is one of the chief causes of its excellence. Neither Count Waldersee nor Count Schlieffen, the two men who have been appointed to succeed Count Moltke as chief of the staff, was known to the public at large, and neither has ever yet held an independent command in action. The one supreme condition, the purity of the fountain-head, no public opinion can guarantee; only the “spirit” that dwells in the immediate confidence of the ruler and makes itself felt down to the common soldier can do that.

What public opinion is capable of doing with regard to an army we have witnessed in France, even since the crushing lesson of 1870. General Boulanger was installed at the War Office, his popularity daily on the increase. If, during that period, one of those frontier squabbles had led to war, General Boulanger would

have been called by public opinion, perhaps, to the chief command of the army. In this instance public opinion might have placed the fates of weal and woe of a nation of thirty-eight millions in the hands of an intriguer of doubtful ability. Another recent instance of the line adopted by public opinion in army matters in Austria is related farther on.

If we are to judge by our own experience of public opinion in England, we may fairly assume that, if we were engaged in a serious struggle, we should be burdened with heroes. Not so in the case of Prussia in the War of 1870. The mightiest war of modern times hardly produced a dozen men around the brows of whom public opinion could weave its meretricious wreaths. It was not intended it should. It was looked upon as bad form in the army to be thought a hero; quiet duty was the watchword. It is eminently characteristic of the above that when Bismarck inquired after his sons during the war, he did not ask their superior officer whether they had *distinguished themselves*, but only whether they had *done their duty*. Strange reading this, for many of those who feel the craving—the lust—for individual distinction.

Cheap heroism—distinction—would often have been easier to gain than to fulfil quiet duty. Men who had been too anxious to distinguish themselves were looked at askance by their comrades. After the war a silent etiquette was promulgated that conversations relating to individual prowess were to be avoided. Everybody was expected to do his duty and nothing more. The result proved that it had been fairly done. The directing mind saw that it was not done in vain.

The campaigns of 1864, of 1866, of 1870, came and passed. Their butchers' bills were quietly settled without swords and bayonets bending, cartridges jamming, and fighting men being poisoned by rotten provisions. Would that our historians could say the same of the recent English brawls with savages!

It may be thought that the Iron Cross¹ was, after all, a premium on personal distinction, and so it was in one sense, but not in a vulgar, sporting sense. The Iron Cross came as a reward for duty done more than for personal distinction achieved, and in its application and distribution a truly democratic spirit prevailed. The Iron Cross was in many instances on the breast of the sergeant and common soldier before it was affixed to the uniform of those in responsible command. Leaving the ranks to carry wounded comrades to the rear—a common form of distinction in some countries—was hardly a passport to the Iron Cross in 1870. Bismarck is said to have jokingly remarked to a German prince, who like himself wore the Iron Cross, that they had both received it as a compliment.

V

But as everything has its two sides, so too the aspects of personal achievement. Nor do we mean to say that there was no element of individual prowess in 1870. We only mean to imply that the cheap sort of meretricious heroism at the expense of duty, which has been and would again be ruin in serious battle,

¹ An order bestowed on those in the German army who are deemed worthy of reward for service.

was not encouraged nor rewarded. To prove that every rule may have its exceptions, we cannot help mentioning one of the few facts that have come to our knowledge in which the limits of duty were almost exceeded in a quiet, unostentatious, and chivalrous manner. It was at the hard-fought battle of Gravelotte that a company of the Alexander Guard infantry regiment was standing under a withering hail of bullets. The men were ordered to lie down under cover. The officers alone, as if by a superhuman instinct, remained upright, to show the men that, although they were not to be needlessly exposed, there was even more expected of those who were placed above them. Of twenty officers, eighteen were killed or wounded on that occasion. If their action was an excess of duty, it was not of a meretricious character. It was done quietly, unostentatiously, with no reporters in sight, and with no individual reward to follow. The true reward was, however, found in the devotion of the troops themselves. For a few days afterward, on the road to Sedan, this very company marched twenty-three hours out of the twenty-four without leaving a single man behind.

Few things call more for our attention than the wonderful marching capacity of the German army. It is an unerring proof of the moral strength of an army, for its source is far more of a moral than of a physical nature. When the War of 1870 broke out, a friend of ours, who had three brothers who were officers in the Prussian army, expressed himself thus: "Think of me; we shall march the French to death." And the battle of Sedan proved he was right. For it was above

all this tremendous capacity for marching which enabled the German army to surround that unfortunate town as with an iron ring. One of the most striking instances of this marching aptitude and the moral force connected with it was Blücher's junction with Wellington two days after the former's defeat at Ligny. Heinrich von Treitschke has written the following regarding it:¹

The Emperor Francis said to the officers of Blücher's staff: "You Prussians are devilish fellows." And Metternich admitted to Freiherr von Stein that an Austrian army would have required at least six weeks to recover from such a defeat—whereupon Stein answered with emphasis: "There you see what moral force can do!"

It is not so much success as the causes which lead to it that must interest the observer.

The English monthly periodicals dwell from time to time on the efficiency of our army, and draw comparisons between it and those of continental nations. Lately a writer in the *Contemporary Review* stated that "the German armies were defeated by the First Republic and by the empire of France because they were living on the 'old traditions' of Frederick, and had not adapted themselves to the new conditions. For precisely the same reasons the Austrians in 1866 and the French in 1870 went down before the Germans."

This statement is all very well as applying to certain problems of military science; but the "new conditions" mentioned are not identical, nor covered by any new systems of military tactics or strategy. For

¹ "History of the Nineteenth Century," H. von Treitschke, Vol. I, page 769.

instance, in 1866 the Austrian artillery was superior to the Prussian, and in 1870 the French rifles were again far superior to the German needle-gun. The fact is that the "new conditions" are as old as the days of Sparta; besides all tactical innovations and strategical skill in the leadership, they mean the fighting condition of a healthy, strong community with a great cause, and full moral confidence in that cause, at its back. The "old traditions" are as old as Darius and the battle of Arbela, and mean the going down of an order of things that has outlived itself through age or unfitness or corruption before the onslaught of health and strength.

The "old traditions" are alive in our midst in England, as shown by the evidence of the Royal Commission to inquire into the weapons and ammunition of our army after the late Egyptian campaign, and it reported that the bayonets, the swords, as well as the ammunition, supplied were partly defective or useless. The flour was rotten, the biscuits mildewed, and almost every other article of food inferior or adulterated. And yet there was nobody to hang! When a regiment was to embark from an Irish port, it was found that half the men were dead drunk. These are the old traditions!

In Prussia, such is the honest thoroughness and efficient solicitude for the army that, when the War of 1870 broke out, as if by magic the whole army was found supplied with an excellent food, the very name of which—the now celebrated "pea-sausage"—had never before been heard of by the public. Such is an instance of the "new conditions" of modern warfare.

It is this wondrous efficiency, this honest and effective administration and devotion to duty, which arrest our attention.

VI

We repeat, it is the honest devotion to duty of the unit in the army which impresses us more than the genius of its leaders. The one must pass away, and men will come forward who are comparatively untried, but the other can, and must, remain at all hazards.

The German subaltern officer works in the midst of his men; he presides not only over the drill, which in England is left to non-commissioned officers, but he is their moral as well as their technical instructor. His whole heart is in his profession and with his men, like a foreman in a workshop. Thus he exercises an influence over the character of the rank and file confided to his care that remains with them in after-life. The Prussian army has been the means of raising the moral as well as the physical standard of the masses of the country.

The following extract from the German Field Service Regulations for 1887, issued for the use of the rank and file of the army, may prove interesting:

The soldier may learn to march and to handle his weapons by practice; also his body and his mental powers may be developed and steeled; but time alone can produce that discipline which is the keystone of the army. This is the first condition of every success, and must be cultivated and nurtured above everything else. A superficial cohesion merely gained through practice will give way in critical moments and under the influence of unforeseen occurrences. Only by the most thorough training of the unit can the necessary *cohesive* action



MOLTKE BEFORE PARIS WITH HIS AIDES-DE-CAMP

of the many be attained. . . . The officer is the teacher and leader in every department. This necessitates his possessing superiority of knowledge and of experience, as well as superior strength of character. Without fear of responsibility, every officer in every crisis—even the most exceptional—must devote his whole being to the task of carrying out his instructions, even without waiting for orders respecting details. The personal behavior of the officer is the most decisive influence on the rank and file, for the inferior is subject to the impression that coolness and determination make all along the line. It is not sufficient to command; the manner of the commanding exercises a great influence over subordinates. Conduct and example create confidence, and nerve the troops to action that commands success. . . . Every one—from the highest officer down to the youngest soldier—must always bear in mind that omission and neglect are more punishable than a mistake in the choice of means of action.

VII

In the Prussian army such a thing as appointment by “public form” and promotion by favoritism—not to speak of nepotism—has hitherto been comparatively unknown. An officer might enjoy the intimate personal friendship of the old Emperor William without its having the slightest influence on his preferment. It would have even been powerless to avert his premature retirement, if he had been judged unequal to the responsibility of a higher command. A rigid system of continually testing the capacity of officers was ever at work. No length of service would have entitled a man to promotion, unless his superiors in command were thoroughly convinced he was in every way fitted for it. After ten or twelve years’ service as a lieutenant, a man may be judged fitted to lead a company,

and thus receives the rank of captain. He may be the best company leader in the Prussian service, and yet not have the material for a field officer. If such be the opinion of his superiors, he has no hopes of ever becoming a major. When his turn for promotion comes, he receives a quiet hint to retire, and, as a sop, he carries the titular distinction of major into private life, and silently vanishes from the scene. Service in the Prussian army is a national duty, and not necessarily a career for the individual. The dismissal may mean shattered hopes, or a lost career it may be, but it is inevitable, in the interest of the community, in the interest of the huge man-slaying machine, in which each man is the tiniest rivet, and nothing more.

This same test is rigorously applied to every promotion up to the rank of full general. That such a merciless system of mutual observation and criticism can exist without degenerating into a hotbed of intrigue and favoritism is in itself the highest testimony to the moral qualities of the Prussian officer. In other countries the command of a whole army is often given to an incapable general, and the results are invariably such as might be expected.

There is no regard for individual sensitiveness in the German army. There they root it out stump and branch in the interest of the country. No title, no family connections, however powerful, are able to do more than enable an officer to serve in one of a few exclusive regiments, but are by no means able to guarantee his promotion therein. And yet, when we bear in mind what the Prussian aristocracy has done toward making the army what it is, we could even understand

a little favoritism, for they have had their bones broken for generations in the army service, hardly ever earning any material reward in return. If pride of birth be pardonable, it is so in this instance of generations of unselfish devotion to a hard service. To be nearly related to a great Prussian commander is, if anything, a drawback, for the spirit of rigid impartiality toward one's own kith and kin has before now been the means of even hindering an officer's advancement.

Bismarck's two sons went into the Franco-German War as privates in the Dragoon Guards, and—most remarkable—in Germany it was taken only as a matter of course. William Bismarck, the younger, had even served nearly a whole year previously in the same humble capacity. Such an absence of nepotism is to be found only in Prussia. It is looked upon as a matter of course; it exists in all branches of the state service, and is one of the reasons the Prussian administration works so thoroughly.

One of Field-Marshal Moltke's aides-de-camp throughout the Franco-German War—his brother-in-law—came out of it with no higher rank than captain, and retired some years later through ill-health as major on half-pay. (The number of those whose health was subsequently shattered by that struggle almost equaled those of the killed and wounded.)

This very poverty is one of the hoops of steel that bind the Prussian army. The day the Prussian officers cease to be poor, that day the supremacy of the Prussian army will be on the wane. The danger of luxury is a greater one than any foreign combination.

The present emperor, when still Prince William, said as much when he gave those peremptory orders to his regiment against gambling that created such a sensation at the time. The keystone of the moral influence and of the position of the Prussian officer is to be sought in the rigid cultivation of the point of honor that may seem almost exaggerated to our eyes. The slightest slur on the character of a Prussian officer is fatal to his chances of promotion, even if it does not entail his immediate dismissal. Thus, cases of suicide are very frequent from causes that would appear trivial indeed to those who are not conversant with the rigidity of Prussian notions on this subject. For an officer to become implicated in a brawl or quarrel connected with personal violence, even if innocent, often entails ruin, as it is the uniform he wears that must be kept sacred at all hazards.

VIII

So much for a few of the characteristics of the "new conditions." But there are other questions besides merely those of efficiency of commissariat, conscientiousness in the performance of duty, intellectual acquirements of the officers and leaders, and freedom from foul patronage and nepotism which come up for consideration when we examine the qualifications of a victorious army. It is not only the old tactical traditions which go down before the modern improved "system"; it is the meaner impulse that invariably succumbs to the higher, the morally effete to the strong and healthy. As the Persians went down before the Greeks, and as they in their turn suc-

cumbed to the Romans, so the latter in their effeminacy bit the dust before hardy barbarian hordes.

How clearly the importance of the moral influence is shown by Oliver Cromwell in his letter:

How can we expect loafers and tapsters to stand up against gentlemen with a keen sense of honor and loyalty to their sovereign? We must give them an even higher impetus: we must appeal to their God!

And from that day forward, even without new tactical systems, down went the Royalists! They went down before the fierce Covenanters, who sought death at their hands, but kept their powder dry.

In later times, we see the same "spirit" at work deciding the fate of nations. In the American War of Independence the oft-victorious English had to lower their standard to their own kin. The watchword of "God save the King" was unable to stifle the cry of men fighting for their existence.

The young French Republic singing the "Marseillaise" and throwing off the tyranny of a corrupt feudalism was victorious as long as it fought against such, for it was not so much the old fighting system that lowered Prussia's flags at Jena as the fact of its army having become a haughty, self-indulgent, separate caste, no longer identical with the nation. But as soon as the French watchword of "glory" was seriously tested against the devoted religious fanaticism of the Russians, not even the genius of a Napoleon could prevail. And once the German nation rose to Luther's hymn, "Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott" (A strong fortress is our God); when once Ernst Moritz Arndt gave out his "Der Gott, der Eisen wachsen

liess, der wollte keine Knechte" (The God who bid that iron be, could never wish for slaves); when this spirit rose, the day of glory ("le jour de gloire" of the "Marseillaise") had sunk into night, and the French marshals were beaten in every engagement in which the great Napoleon did not command in person until the battle of Leipzig gave him the finishing stroke.

It may be an effect of the imagination, but when we remember the soul-stirring sounds of the famous "Watch on the Rhine" we think we hear the manifestation of that invincible spirit against which it was but natural that the "Marseillaise" should shriek in vain. When we recall those public gatherings in Carlsruhe, Berlin, and elsewhere after the news of the first victories, when the bareheaded crowd joined in those soul-stirring chorals of Luther's, we feel that such a spirit was bound to conquer.¹

So much for the action of the divine instinct which binds us to the unseen and unknown in its influence on the affairs of man in war. It is divine inasmuch as it appeals to and draws its strength from something higher than our every-day selfishness and vanity—the devotion of each unit to the welfare of the entirety. Where this spirit prevails in the administration as well as in the people, cartridges will be found to go off; there also provisions will be found adequate, and there

¹ Regarding the spirit that animated the German troops in 1870, we hold the following testimony from W. McKellar, an English surgeon, who accompanied the German troops and was taken prisoner by the French at Orleans: "There was any amount of heroic courage among the French, an indescribable enthusiasm animated the Germans. I met several, mortally wounded, who gloried in their wounds to the exclusion of all meaner thought of self. One young fellow of the artillery—one of four brothers, two of whom fell during the war—was brought in to me at Orleans with a thigh crushed. Quite forgetting his mortal suffering, he raised his head, and pointing to the eagle on his helmet, cried out: 'With God for King and Fatherland'" (the motto on the Prussian helmets).

will victory incline. May that stern sense of devotion to duty, may that rare efficiency and integrity in its administrators, may that earnest enthusiasm for an independent, united Fatherland, long distinguish the Germans and preserve them the great nation they deserve to be!

IX

Others may try to copy the system which has shown such excellent results, but they cannot suddenly appropriate the qualities that have made the German army what it is. The one and the other are too much bound up in the qualities of the people, and are the result of the laborious work of generations. Parliamentary legislation born of an excited expression of public opinion cannot supply such to order.

To take but one special feature that has done so much to raise the moral value of the rank and file of the German army—the leavening of the mass with the educated element—the one-year service. It has been tried in France, and had to be given up. The rank and file of that land of equality, instead of benefiting by its association with the educated classes, were envious of the favored elements, sneered at them as “aristos” (aristocrats), and made their life a misery to them. The consequence is that everybody in France now serves equally his full time in the ranks, and many of the educated classes leave the army thoroughly disgusted with the hardship and coarseness of the life and its associations. The career of General Boulanger in itself throws a lurid light on the incapacity to raise the higher ranks of the army

to a level that could inspire confidence in their discipline.

The French have copied the cunning of espionage, but the unity of moral purpose does not seem yet to be theirs. They have a great military history, and they love war; the imagination of the race is captivated by it, but it is doubtful whether the temperament of the people fits them for its requirements in our day. The next struggle will solve that question. But one thing is certain: the days of the "handsome soldier" of popular imagination—the prize-fighting warriors of old—are gone from the scene of modern warfare forever. The tactical training of the unit under a model organization of the whole led by the comprehensive mind, more surely than ever wins the day. The highest discipline without red tape seems to be the recipe for victory nowadays, for nowhere is independence of judgment, freedom of initiative, from the leader of army corps down to the non-commissioned officer, so cultivated and encouraged as in the German army. The French temperament possesses these qualities to an eminent degree, but it lacks one of the most important qualities that lead to success always—the due subordination of the individual.

Of Austrian military affairs we do not often hear much, but that little is usually of a derogatory nature. At the time of the occupation of Bosnia and the Herzegovina, after the Treaty of Berlin, their cavalry not only managed to receive a check at the hands of irregulars, but, almost amusing to relate, their soldiers were on several occasions in danger of starvation. Poor, simple souls; their leaders had doubtless heard of the

wealth of Prussia during the War of 1870, and, with true Austrian cunning, they had provided themselves with money! The unimportant fact that Bosnia is not identical with wealthy agricultural France had not suggested itself to these strategic thinkers.

But far worse than all this was the little episode at Graz in 1888. Austrian public opinion was in a fever of surmise at the sudden retirement of General von Kuhn. The journals of the dual monarchy expressed their surprise, and united in the hope that the army would not lose the services of such an eminent soldier in the hour of need. No sooner had public opinion let us into its high estimate of General von Kuhn than that distinguished officer himself assists us to form an estimate of its egregious folly. In his speech to five hundred officers at Graz who made a demonstration in his favor, carrying him home on their shoulders and flourishing their swords, he proved himself to be a braggart, as the following few excerpts prove:

My prowess at Santa Lucia is known; it belongs to history. It is less known, perhaps, that at Costozza I stood with only two guns and without any cover against a whole army corps, and thus partially contributed to the success of the day. . . . In the year 1859 I had the intention of taking the offensive. That it did not take place was not my fault. If the offensive had been followed up, things would look different in Europe to-day (!). If we had taken the offensive at Sadowa, the victory would have been ours.

Of such stuff are some officers who hold the highest commands still made in Austria, and such is the standard of the rank of the officers that five hundred of them could be found to applaud it. No wonder the

Austrian emperor judged it was time to retire such a man!

It is not too much to say that the conduct of General von Kuhn, as well as that of the five hundred Austrian officers, was as discreditable as it would be impossible in Germany. It only proves how far the Austrians are yet from that ideal standard of efficiency which they fancy they have learned by their defeats from the Prussians.

What a contrast to a man such as Von Moltke! Lord Wolseley does not believe he will go down to posterity as one of the greatest captains; but strip him of strategic exploits that seek in vain in history for a parallel to the magnitude of their scale, strip him of the literary ability that has given us charming books of travel, and a purity, a terseness, a dignity of style that has earned a comparison with Tacitus for the history of the War of 1870, issued by the Prussian General Staff; strip him of all this, and a character remains, unsullied in its spotless integrity as in its sober simplicity: a cultivated intellect of the highest order.

The man whose iron, unquestioned, supreme decision winged the flight of Prussian victory was almost a hermit in the privacy of his Silesian retreat. In her greatest strategist, Germany produced a character of the very highest type, one far removed from the feverish self-advertising egotism of our time. One who stood nearest to him by the ties of relationship and friendship once assured us: "The field-marshal is above all a man of almost childlike purity of mind, one to whom the shady sides of human nature have

remained, so to say, unknown." No wonder that even victory and worldly glory were powerless to affect the character of such a man. His estimate of the value of popularity is best recorded in his own words: "When I have to listen to the boundless flatteries bestowed on one by the public, I cannot dismiss for an instant the thought, How would it have been if success—unexampled success—had not crowned our enterprise?"

When this silent warrior spoke, for whom the Germans have found in their expressive language the beautiful words, *der Schlachtenlenker*, *der Schlachten-denker* (the battle-ruler, the battle-thinker), it was the trumpet-blast of war that called for his utterances. They crystallized; they turned to granite to mark the mile-stones of history in which his country figures victoriously. Our Wellington in Spain, and Cincinnatus in Rome, unite to furnish historical parallels to Count Moltke's character. His example is the proudest possession of the Prussian army.

On the eve of his ninety-first birthday (October 25, 1890), the *Reichsanzeiger* brought the following tribute to his fame:

Field-Marshal Count Von Moltke completes his ninetieth year on Sunday. In accordance with the will of his majesty the emperor and king, and the feelings of all classes of the people, all Germany celebrates this birthday as a national festival. For the nation owes it in no small measure to the deeds of the veteran field-marshal that it is united in a powerful empire, that its prestige among the nations of Europe has been greatly enhanced, and that it has now long been able to devote itself undisturbed to the labors of peace. It is a tribute due to the field-marshal, glory-crowned, undefeated, and yet great

also in simplicity and modesty, when, on this day of honor, princes and people with one accord express their gratitude to him in the most convincing manner. Ninety years of a precious and blessed, but also laborious, life lie behind him. They form a reflection of the destinies of Germany. To Mecklenburg belongs the honor of having given the Fatherland not only Queen Louisa and the national hero of the Wars of Liberation, Prince Blücher of Wahlstatt, but also the greatest general of this age.

After giving a detailed account of the field-marshal's career, and describing the manner in which the emperor and the people were preparing to do him honor, the *Reichsanzeiger* concludes:

But above and beyond all outward festal arrangements, our eyes are raised in prayers of thanksgiving for all that Heaven has given the German people in and with "our Moltke," and also in the earnest hope that the venerable field-marshal may long be permitted to enjoy the gratitude of his king and Fatherland, and that the German nation and the German army may long be destined to see him among them, their brightest example.

And here let us add the official text of the emperor's congratulatory speech to Count Moltke on the same occasion:

My dear Field-Marshal—I have come to-day, with many illustrious personages and the leaders of my army, to express our heartiest and most deep-felt congratulations. For us, to-day is a day of retrospect, and especially of gratitude. First and foremost, I express my thanks in the name of those who worked and fought along with you, and who are gone, and whose faithful and devoted servant you were. I thank you for all you have done for my house, and for the promotion of the greatness of our Fatherland. We greet in you not only the Prussian leader who has won for our army the reputation of invincibility, but also one of the founders and welders of our

German Empire. You see before you high and illustrious princes from all parts of Germany—above all, his majesty the king of Saxony, who was a faithful ally of my grandfather, and who has not let slip the opportunity of proving his attachment to you in person. We are reminded of the time when he was permitted to fight side by side with you for the greatness of Germany.

The high distinctions which my late grandfather bestowed upon you have left me no means of specially testifying my own gratitude; I, therefore, beg you to accept one mark of respect, the only homage I can do you in my youth. It is the prerogative of the monarch to have the emblems on which his soldiers take the oath, which fly before his troops, and symbolize the honor of his arms and the valor of his army, standing in his anteroom. It is with peculiar pride that I renounce this right for to-day, and beg you to allow the colors of my Guards, which have so often waved under you in many hard-fought battles, to find a place in your dwelling. A lofty history lies in the ribbons and tattered colors that stand before you, a history which has been written chiefly by yourself.

I beg you to accept this token of your rank [the emperor here presented the baton] as a personal souvenir of myself and as a memento of this day. The real field-marshal's baton, which you earned under fire before the enemy, has long been in your hands. This is only a sign and symbol of my respect, veneration, and gratitude. I beg you, gentlemen, to join me in the cry, "God bless, preserve, and cherish our venerable field-marshal, long a blessing to the army and the Fatherland." We are grateful to him for being great enough not to stand alone, but to form a school of military leaders who, trained in his spirit, will be the strength and glory of our army.

SUMMARY

Unlike most nations, Germany has maintained its great army to preserve peace. This army is probably the best in the world, with its arms and equipments

maintained at the highest standard, and has won the admiration of all other nations. Though acts of heroism are appreciated to-day, the time of the professional hero is past. Modern warfare demands that an army become a great, relentless machine in which each part performs its duty. This sense of duty is the keynote of German military success, for modern warfare makes ever-increasing demands for personal sacrifice. Prussian officers hold their positions not so much for personal bravery as for talent in the disposition of their troops. In striking contrast with the power of popular clamor in France, public opinion in Germany holds but little weight in the selection of officers, for at each successive promotion they are severely tested. Even family distinction is of little consequence. The Iron Cross is awarded for duty done, and is often bestowed upon the subordinate first. The French copied the one-year system of service, but had to give it up. They have tried the system of espionage, but have not yet achieved the unity of moral purpose which pervades the German army. The ideal type of the German soldier was Von Moltke, one of the greatest strategists of the age—a man of remarkable purity of mind, simplicity, and greatness of character—“*Der Schlachtenlenker, der Schlachtendenker.*”

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. How has the army influenced the German people?
2. How do the Germans look upon “martial glory”?
3. Give instances of their appreciation of true chivalry.
4. How do the requirements of modern warfare differ from those of ancient times?

5. What is the keynote of Germany's success in battle?
6. How do they usually rate an enemy?
7. What does the case of General Steinmetz illustrate?
8. Compare the influence of public opinion upon the army in France and in Germany.
9. What is true of the marching capacity of the German army?
10. Contrast "old traditions" and "new conditions" in modern warfare.
11. Illustrate the fact that favoritism and social position are not factors in army promotion.
12. What is the purpose of the one-year service?
13. Describe the character of Von Moltke.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Letters of Von Moltke. Translated by Bell and Fischer.
Germany, Present and Past. S. Baring-Gould.
See also bibliographies following Chapters I, IV, and VI.

CHAPTER VIII

THE GERMAN ARISTOCRACY

Unde superbit homo, cujus conceptio culpa,
Nasci poena, labor vita, necesse mori!¹

I

Not only in its character, but in its very composition, the German aristocracy shows a marked contrast to that of England. With us many of the most eloquent panegyrists of aristocracy are to be found outside its own charmed circle; in Germany it would be difficult to find many sympathizers with the nobility among the middle classes or among the masses. And the explanation is not to be sought only in the difference of the two aristocracies themselves. Differences of evolution, of tradition, and of influence account for this and many other peculiarities of the German aristocracy.

We remember the surprise of a great Prussian landowner on being told of the almost tyrannical power our land laws and our leasehold system give to an English territorial grandee. "How can your people put up with it?" he exclaimed. And yet such is the case. We have long put up with things that have produced revolutions elsewhere. And yet the English aristocracy still has a large following in the country, while in

¹ Wherefore is man proud, whose conception is a sin, whose birth is a penalty, whose life is a toil, and for whom death is inevitable.

Germany the nobility has next to none. Weighty causes must be found to account for this, quite independent of any amount of servility in the English character, or any want of that amiable compound in the German; both nations, to start with, may have little to reproach themselves with on that score. These causes will be found to exist to a large extent in the following facts and their consequences.

II

The German aristocracy, notwithstanding its many strong points, has been not only guilty of great class selfishness—like privileged classes in other countries—but it has been the victim of its own short-sighted and narrow class feeling. In England a far-sighted policy of sacrificing its units has strengthened the power for good and for evil of an aristocratic caste. In Germany the anxiety of each unit to retain its shadowy advantages has resulted in the loss of what was most valuable to retain, and in the retention of much which, though of small value to-day, has contributed not a little to reap for its holders that lack of sympathy of which we find the German aristocracy the object in its own country.

In olden times a title meant more than a mere empty attribute of privileged birth; it meant a position of power, either personal or inherited. Not so many centuries ago, even the offspring of royal blood in England—not to mention the sons of the nobility—were commoners. Royalty has in our day adopted the fiction that every son of a king is born a prince. The

main difference between the aristocracy of England and that of Germany is to be found in the fact that the German aristocracy has slavishly adopted the example of royalty, whereas the English aristocracy has, up to the present day, held to the original idea that a title must represent power. Primogeniture is the keynote of English aristocratic power; the title is reserved to the eldest son, who inherits the bulk of the property. Thus an English title usually means a large landowner. A German title means in most cases nothing more than an amiable descendant of one of many who once, perhaps, owned land and power. The English aristocracy lives on its estates in the country, and there forms centers of social and political life. The small percentage of the German aristocracy which lives in the country, even if rich, usually leads a life of economy, solitude, and intellectual stagnation. It wields neither great social nor political influence.

Not only in the transmission of titles have the Germans copied the example of royalty, but in other points of scarcely minor importance. The modern royal customs—even laws—of intermarrying only with equals, which were originally designed for political purposes only, have found servile followers among the German aristocracy, without any excuse or pretense of policy. The consequences of such action have shown themselves to be disastrous in more senses than one. They have resulted in the gradual erection of a barrier which in our day may be said to divide the aristocracy of birth from the aristocracy of intellect and the middle classes more than they are so divided in any other European country.

The Germans, who before now have been accused of pedantry and doctrinarism, have proved themselves essentially pedantic and doctrinaire in the constitution of their aristocracy.¹ It is an unduly extended and yet a closed oligarchy with a weak action of the heart. In England the aristocracy is constantly strengthened by the admission of new blood. Not only that, but the younger branches of a great house pass untitled and unnoticed back into the commonalty, and carry with them into the middle classes their sympathies for their powerful relations. The German system has had the precisely opposite effect. Each scion of a noble family inherits the title, the social status, and the obligation to marry according to his station (*standes-gemäss*). This erects a barrier between him and the untitled which has proved disastrous in its results all around. What would a German petty baron think of the son of an English duke, whose ancestry might put half the "Almanach de Gotha"² to shame, marrying a commoner's daughter, or entering a wine merchant's or a stockbroker's office? And yet the former very often happens, and the latter has happened, in England without lessening by one iota the prestige of the aristocracy. The well-connected English member of the middle classes may well look upon a peer as only his superior by chance of primogeniture; he is of the same stock—of the same flesh and blood. The German untitled citizen is cut off from the aristocracy without even an imaginary connecting link.

¹ This applies even with greater force to the Austrians, who in this as in so many other points are one with the Germans.

² An annual publication containing among other data lists of the royal families and aristocracies of Europe.

In Saxony, indeed, so distinct is the line that separates the aristocracy from the people that the former can even be seen to be of an entirely different race from the latter. The Saxon nobility is a tall, fair-haired race, with the true Germanic cast of features, whereas the mass of the population is rather short and thick-set, with features bearing distinct traces of Slavonic blood.

III

German pedantry hugs the magical word *von*,¹ the idea of quarterings—even if they be emblazoned on empty space—and, in so doing, has often, here as elsewhere, sacrificed the substance for the shadow. Thus, German pedantry has no idea of the English feeling which classes untitled families among the proudest aristocracy of the country—such as have refused titles, but are well known by their honorable standing of generations. It is the *von* that does it, not the distinction of the family. Though, once the *von* possessed, it must be admitted that an old, inferior title stands far higher than a modern one of more ambitious sound. Far be it from us to lose sight of the splendid qualities to be found among the German aristocracy. Still, we cannot help deploring what we must consider the weak points of an institution which must reform, or lose much that its well-wishers would gladly see it retain.

Even German royalty has of late set the German aristocracy a shining example of rising superior to class prejudice, not only in the matter of marriage

¹ *Von* (of) is prefixed to the names of titled persons as originally indicating the possessor of an estate or castle which formed the last name.

(this it has often done), but in another direction. Duke Charles Theodore of Bavaria has set up in regular practice as an oculist at his own expense. He has built a regular hospital for eye diseases, in which the poor receive advice gratis. He himself has his daily hours of consultation, from two till five o'clock, in his own house, where, assisted by a young doctor in his employ, he gives free advice to patients of every station. It is stated that in the course of a few months he gave advice to two thousand eight hundred patients and performed two hundred and ninety operations, among them some of difficulty, requiring great skill. It is interesting to note that his wife, a princess of Braganza, thoroughly enters into her husband's profession, and constantly performs the duties of nurse to his patients.

Another Bavarian prince, Louis Ferdinand, uncle of the present king—married to the Spanish infanta, Maria de la Paz—studied medicine in Munich and Heidelberg. The Bavarian government waived the state examination in his favor, and he is now entering on regular practice. Princess Helene of Schleswig-Holstein—aunt of the present German empress—is not only married to Professor von Esmarch, the eminent surgeon, but he is recognized by the imperial relatives of his wife, including the emperor, and is on the best of terms with them. Lastly, a Würtemberg princess is married to a Breslau doctor, and, strange to say, instead of raising himself in the profession by such a match, he is even said to be looked upon askance by his colleagues for having married out of his sphere of life.

What the untitled intellectual class of Germany thinks of the prejudices and privileges of the German aristocracy is well illustrated by the following words of the eminent writer, Gustav Freytag : ¹

The German commoner will ever be an uncompromising opponent of all those political and social privileges by which the aristocracy still claim an exceptional position among the people. Not because he is envious of these usages, or that he would wish to put himself in their place, but because he recognizes sadly (*ohne Freude*) that in their consequence they are apt to warp their judgment, their knowledge of the world, and also their firmness of character. Not only that, but because some of these antiquated traditions, such as the privileged position of the aristocracy at court, even expose our princes to the danger of sinking down into the narrow horizon of the German *Junker*. For the noblest force, the leadership in the domain of ideal and practical affairs, lies with the citizen class.

IV

Changes are more easily suggested than carried out, especially when, as in the case of the German aristocracy, a good deal is to be said for things as they are.

Its very poverty has called forth special virtues, and in many other ways the German aristocracy has been able to retain much that is valuable and in danger of being swept away in our democratic age. But even taking the good manners and breeding, so beneficial in social intercourse—the sense of chivalry often communicated from father to son—at their highest estimate, we must deplore the more that narrow spirit which has so limited their sphere of influence.

¹ "Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit" (Pictures from Germany's Past), Vol. IV.

The English aristocracy is popular because, side by side with the greatest possible development of class power, it has retained its connection with the people by its younger sons, who mingle and intermarry with the middle classes. It is popular because its ranks are constantly recruited from the people, even if in a somewhat eccentric fashion. But, above all, the sources of its popularity must be sought in the extraordinary instances of strong characters it has always had the good fortune to produce. And not only this, but because the peculiarities of its constitution have ever allowed such characters to wield political power, and thus to attain great personal popularity. English nobles have dazzled the popular imagination by their liberal ideas, by their generosity, by their individual superiority to class selfishness. They have not weakened the power of their class by so doing, but strengthened its hold on the feelings of their countrymen. And to what an extent they have been successful in so doing may be judged by those who fully realize what the power of a title is to-day in England in our democratic age of transition. An unworthy subserviency of the middle classes, a base instinct of cringing and toadying to the fountain of many favors, may explain some, but it does not explain, by any means, all the hold the English aristocracy has retained on the imagination of the people. Least of all does it explain the hold it has on the uneducated masses. That influence is partly due to many excellent qualities which the English privileged class has shown from time immemorial.

English popular feeling, rightly or wrongly, regards

the aristocracy as a curb on the pretension of royalty. The German people look upon their aristocracy as the toadies of royalty. English nobles do not care to hang about a court like German nobles, for the German nobles, as a class, feel it their vocation to serve the crown. They have less sentiment for the country at large, less of a broader patriotism.

The quarrel of Bismarck with the late Count Arnim revealed some of those characteristics of the Prussian court noble which are so distasteful to the people at large; in fact, it may be said that the popular feeling that Bismarck was fighting an aristocratic court intrigue upheld his popularity through this memorable trial. Rich Englishmen of position do not like the scraping and bowing of court life; it is foreign to the best English character. They either mix with princes on terms of semi-equality or avoid them.

But we are not writing a treatise on the English aristocracy, and we only mention some of its strong points and their results in order to show more markedly how similar evidences of class influence are absolutely non-existent in Germany. We can but draw our conclusions. Who would ever expect a noble German landowner to head a subscription list for any scientific or charitable purpose? Who ever thinks of asking a noble in Germany to preside at a public dinner? The German Philistine would feel his dignity offended by so doing, though he might be willing to toady quickly enough to a high-placed official; but to subordinate himself to a mere title would revolt his nobler self. The German will bow and cringe to a powerful official, but not to a mere empty title. The same may almost

be said of the highly cultured professional and mercantile classes. The feeling of reverence for the aristocracy does not exist in the form we know it.

As for the lower orders, their sentiments for the nobility are such that the least said of them the better. The distrust felt toward the nobility by the masses is so great that the German Conservative party has to take it into account, and is often forced to put forward parliamentary candidates without titles, fearing that it would be impossible to carry through one of its own order. In England, a personal connection of a prominent public man or of a great landlord is sure of a following among the electorate. Even a man like Mr. Gladstone had to fight hard in a Liberal constituency against the influence of the young and politically unknown son of the great Scotch landowner, the Duke of Buccleuch. In Germany, being the son of a great landowner would avail a candidate next to nothing. Even the son of a Bismarck has found it no easy matter to court a German constituency.

V

It would indeed be reading the signs of the times wrongly if we deduced this marked difference only from a greater independence of the German people. It is not that, for the German Philistine can be as debasingly fawning as any smiling Briton. The main explanation lies in the difference of the German aristocracy from our own.

It no longer has any power to wield for good or for bad, except in its own society. Elsewhere it has

little or no influence. It has nothing to give, no favors to confer, as the reward for being toadied to. Our aristocracy can still to some extent give and confer. The German nobility has rarely produced men who lead great movements, who stand in the front rank fighting for new ideas, rallying a large following around them, while casting a luster on the class they spring from. And if the cases of Stein and Bismarck are held up to us as proofs of the contrary, we submit that the popularity of these great men was, and is, purely personal, and as it did not spring from, certainly does not at all transmit itself to, the class to which they belong. The susceptibility to such a feeling does not exist.

The German mind can grasp a popular noble only in the light of one who is opposed to his class. The German middle-class mind, ever suspicious and critical, would refuse to believe in an aristocrat, as such, who had not broken with his traditions and cast in his lot with the enemies of his class. This is a great misfortune for the aristocracy, and partly also for the people, as it robs it of the services of many noble-minded men who are driven to consume their high aspirations for the general welfare of the community in inactivity, knowing they are not able to come forth except to excite enmity, without any chance of doing correspondingly good work. That such is the case is largely owing to the short-sighted policy of the German aristocracy as a class from time immemorial. The individual exceptions to such policy have been too unimportant to be worth recording. The German nobility has held to the letter of its privilege, to its

high-sounding titles, to its court sinecures, to its cheap glamour, to its narrow-minded customs of intermarrying, and in so doing has lost, as before said, the substance for the shadow. It has done its best to deepen the ditch between itself and the middle classes, and by so doing has arrayed the latter among its envious enemies. For he who says "envy" may as well say "enemy." The truth of this axiom is most clearly proved by the dying out of the French hatred for their nobility; there is nothing left to envy since they have shrunk into the last refuge of good manners and chivalrous feeling. Such qualities are not striking enough to produce popular enmity.

Let us hope that some day such qualities will awaken universal sympathy and respect in all countries, and produce that best form of flattery, when the flattered are worth flattering—imitation.

It is well known that the German aristocracy has ever used its influence to ostracize the untitled, not only from its own society, but from that of its sovereign. And the smaller the state, the more petty and pertinacious have been its efforts in that direction. And the poorer its representatives, the higher the value they have set on their fictitious possessions of privilege. It is hardly known outside of the Fatherland that, with the exception of the official world, only the titled are privileged to be received at court. And even of the official world itself, the female portion is (beneath a very high rank) excluded from the privileges often only temporarily enjoyed by their husbands—a striking contrast to English social conditions, which do not preclude a wealthy shopkeeper escorting

his "lady" to a reception at the prime minister's house if he be lucky enough to induce his employees to vote him into Parliament. But wealth in England is a certain passport to Parliament, and through Parliament into society. In Germany, neither one nor the other is the case.

Now, though many may think—and in Germany many do so—that the importance of all these trivial distinctions is hardly worth mentioning, we beg to be allowed to hold a very different opinion. German merchants and men of culture will tell you, "We care not for court life, or for the society of our aristocracy; they are not worth having." We cannot share this opinion, even if we were willing to believe that it were always honest, and it did not remind us of the fable of the fox and the grapes.

The German courts, and notably the aristocracy, are still the repositories of social tact and good manners, and it is a great disadvantage to the untitled cultured to be cut off from a free and unrestrained intercourse with such elements. If it does nothing else, it keeps class jealousy and envy alive. But it does more than that; it indirectly influences the excluded in many other ways than they might be prepared to admit—there are certain things people are so unwilling to admit.

VI

Can it be doubted that if the social influence of the great historic German houses—for they include many splendid names, though the acres they possess are rarely as broad and as fat as those in England—could

be brought more directly to bear by more easy intercourse on the cultured untitled, it would beneficially influence them mutually? Such an initiative would open up to the German nobility the full wealth of intellectual power and healthy vitality that is innate in the great German people. Such intercourse would broaden the views of many persons in high positions in Germany, and it would gradually help the German people to a more generous appreciation of the many excellent traits of character often hidden away in old crumbling chateaux or devoted only to useless court routine or sport.

To know is often to love, as ignorance is only too often the parent of hatred as well as of vice. A new departure in this direction would strengthen those excellent feelings of solidarity with all the good in human nature that underlies much of the less amiable outward German characteristics. A mutual understanding between the aristocracy (and through it with royalty) and the middle classes would be a new element of strength in the common battle to be waged against the subversive elements that are gradually coming to the fore in all European countries. Germany was the starting-point of the spiritual rebirth in the Reformation. Germany is in the center of Europe, and standing there, must be the center of support to retain all that is worth retaining from countless generations of effort and strife.

But, besides this more serious aspect, there are minor points to be considered which alone are well worth our wishing the barriers between the aristocracy and the middle classes might be somewhat removed.

German manners in general would be greatly improved thereby. That constant feeling of anxiety as to our position is fatal to ease of manner, and not a little accountable for much petty unhappiness.

Removing the class barrier would facilitate intermarrying, and would tend to make commercial men look at aristocratic officers less as drones who can only marry for money. Rich commoners might marry aristocrats—a rare case now, when thousands of penniless titled women are doomed to celibacy, and often eke out their sad existence in those medieval institutions we find all over Germany—homes for old maids of noble birth. The daughters of the poor aristocracy are sadly handicapped in the competition for husbands. For the accomplished daughters of the supposed wealthy foreigners, the many comely English and American girls who swarm on the Continent, often prove too tempting to the poor German baron, and make him oblivious to the fact that their names lack the magic prefix *von*.

VII

Some of the manifestations of aristocratic class pride would be most amusing if they were not so unfortunate in their results. It is not so long ago that at Hanoverian watering-place dances a line was drawn between the nobility and the untitled. At a little Mecklenburg watering-place such as Heiligenbad a commoner was looked upon as next door to a culprit. And even nearer the large German towns, at public dances a marked division between the classes can still be easily noticed, as the foregoing will lead the reader

to suppose. However, these lamentable traits are only to be met with in the feudal North. Elsewhere, particularly in the democratic South, they would not be tolerated. And even in the North there are many influences at work tending to lessen class prejudice. It dies hardest in the out-of-the-way capitals of some of the petty principalities, where national life pulsates too slowly to kick the beam of nonsense out of sight.

The late Emperor Frederick retained in middle age the pure romantic idealism of early youth. To him every form of privilege and undeserved favor was an abhorrence. He now and then even seemed to go out of his way to honor the untitled. For instance, his friend and aide-de-camp, General Mischke, was not of noble birth. This trait of the emperor's character was one of the reasons of his great popularity with the intellectual classes.

The late Count Alfred Adelmann, a talented writer, broke a lance for the untitled citizen classes and their excellent qualities. He told the aristocracy plainly that it must either work like the rest or go to the wall. To its honor it must be said that there are many more among the nobility who think likewise.

A very amusing and, what is more, an authentic instance of class pride is worth recording. It is instructive as showing how the most vicious qualities of a class are always to be found in its parvenus. A great Berlin banker, who had been ennobled, and whose son was serving in the army, had invited the officers of his son's regiment to dinner. During the dinner the colonel noticed that all the officers of the regiment were present except one who was not in

possession of the noble prefix of *von* to his name. Asking his host why the officer in question was not present, the banker replied, with a smile, "I intended that we should be entirely of our own class!" Whereupon, at a signal from the colonel, all the officers rose and left the house.

It seems a pity that such sentiments do not always meet with a like prompt rebuke. Still, we must say, from wide personal observation, that, notwithstanding the German popular prejudice against the army, as being the hotbed of aristocratic class feeling, it is precisely among German officers that the more absurd prejudices are rebuked and often ludicrously exposed. It is true that there are certain regiments the officers of which are almost exclusively drawn from the nobility, but beyond that it would be the greatest mistake to suppose that a title forms a passport to advancement and positions of responsibility in the German army; nothing of the sort. The powers that be wink at and even encourage a harmless class feeling among the officers, as far as it can be done without harm to the institution itself. And if it maketh the noble's heart glad to know that all his brother officers belong to his set, surely the German military aristocracy has earned a right to such small concessions of sentiment. But there they stop. Once class privilege might interfere with the effectiveness of the huge man-slaying machine, once the sensitiveness of the noble born might endanger the bones of Pomeranian grenadier, it is swept away like cobwebs from the corners of a looking-glass. From the moment responsibility is attached to a post, class privileges count for nothing, and, whether in the

army, in the civil service, or in any other walk of public life, untitled merit takes precedence of the highest birth.

To the honor of the German aristocracy be it said, poor as it may be in coin of the realm, stripped as it may be of territorial, social, or political influence, it stands its ground in the army as well as in the administrative offices of the state with an iron sense of duty and with a high average of intellectual power. In fact, it may be said that the conscientious manner in which the German nobility has performed its duty of late in the army has served more than anything else to decrease the envy that undoubtedly is still felt for it in the Fatherland.

We remember meeting a grizzly-haired count of the Holy Roman Empire, a captain in a Prussian foot regiment—the oldest captain in the army, we were told. At first we could hardly understand a man of his lineage—for his family figured in the “*Almanach de Gotha*”—being only a captain at his age. The oldest captain in the army! What a position of relegated fitness! A glance at the expressionless bullock’s eyes and five minutes’ conversation solved the enigma. His intellectual gifts were limited to the leading of a company, and there he was, leading it. How apposite and fit, how truly Prussian! That one little instance was well calculated to supply us with the key to many a Prussian victory, had we needed one. The aristocrats who guide Prussia’s destinies are not in the habit of giving a son an important command to soothe the feelings of a father whom they feel they cannot again entrust with high office.

VIII

A class peculiar to Germany is the poor aristocracy, for a large percentage of the German nobility is very poor indeed, living from hand to mouth. Among them one long struggle goes on to uphold the privileges of birth against the power of money; and tradition is the only weapon they can wield. Their children are brought up in the Spartan simplicity that inculcates self-denial at an early age. The daughters are accustomed to give way to the sons, who have to serve in the army, and to whose equipment every spare mark must needs be devoted. Outward appearances alone must be kept up at all hazards.

The mother is the head of the family here more than elsewhere. She it is who nurtures the feeling of pride for the noble descent of their family. The veneration for what has descended from bygone generations is excessive, and extends to the merest trifles. An ornament has no value if it can be bought at a jeweler's shop, whereas the most insignificant bit of jewelry is a treasure if it has descended from a great-grandmother.¹ Yet this poor aristocracy, with all its prejudices, has done a great deal to form the sterling hardness of the German character.

Although we must admire the many good points of the German aristocracy, we cannot help thinking their position and prospects as a class to be anything but enviable. Whatever their merits as individuals, as a

¹ It may also be mentioned that members of the German nobility are not in the habit of letting their homes furnished to strangers in order to add to their income, as is nowadays regularly practiced in a country the inhabitants of which pride themselves upon the fact that "their house is their castle."

class they are only too likely to reap what has been sown by their forefathers. The more so that they do not possess a partisan, a worshiper, and an incense-burner in the state church clergy, as in England.

With us, even if the aristocracy were deprived to-morrow of the popular sympathies it enjoys, it would still have the means of adding to its power by the constant addition to its ranks of wealthy commoners, and by our extravagant rewards for any services it may render to the state. In Germany, both these sources of power are non-existent. Wealth does not lead to ennoblement; and services to the state, in whatever capacity, have seldom been extravagantly rewarded. The case of Bismarck is unique; for the dotations to Moltke and other great leaders in the War of 1870 were all but nominal according to our standard. The highest services are invariably rewarded only by the honorary distinction of high orders and the personal friendship of the sovereign, which accompanies its recipient into private life on his retirement on a frugal pension. The consciousness of having done his duty has to make amends for the lack of opportunity of acquiring worldly riches.

To-day, the greater number of aristocracy would, but for the profession of arms, be absolutely penniless, if not breadless. For, although they largely fill the higher government civil appointments, their number is limited, and the pay is so little at the start that only those can enter the service who have something to fall back upon. This can only be looked upon as a great national misfortune, and the more to be deplored when we remember the services the poor Ger-

man aristocracy has rendered to the state as its military servants.

We are almost inclined to ask ourselves, Would German unity ever have come about had it not been for the splendid staff of aristocratic, but poor, officers who have for generations devoted their lives unselfishly to the profession of arms and to the service of the state? The poor German aristocracy has contributed its fair share toward the creation of a powerful, united Fatherland.

SUMMARY

Although the English nobles possess more power than do those of Germany, they are more favorably regarded by the middle class, for in England the old idea that a title must represent power has prevailed. Primogeniture is the keynote of English aristocratic power. An English title usually means a large landowner. The younger members of titled families pass back into the middle classes. The German title implies simply descent; unlike the English nobility, the membership of the noble class is practically fixed. Titles of themselves have had undue regard. While the English aristocracy has been strengthened with new blood, the German has been limited and weakened by intermarriage. This exclusive attitude of the aristocracy, practically the formation of a caste system, has proved a great conservative force. The English nobility are usually progressive, and are held in esteem by the masses as a check on royalty; the German nobility, as a class, have but limited influence. The mistakes of the aristocracy, with its conservative,

exclusive attitude, have been largely responsible for this marked antipathy of classes. Class prejudices, however (stronger in the North than in the South), are slowly dying. Frederick III. did much in his brief time to honor the untitled, and this exclusiveness finds rebuke in the army, if it serves to lessen military efficiency, for the sense of duty conquers the feeling of class pride.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. What does a title represent in England?
2. What in Germany?
3. Why has the custom of intermarriage proved disastrous to the German aristocracy?
4. Why is the sympathy between the aristocracy and the middle classes stronger in England?
5. Give instances in which German royalty has risen superior to class prejudice.
6. What is the attitude of the German commoner to the aristocracy?
7. Why has the English titled class so strong a hold upon the people?
8. What relation do the English and German aristocracy respectively hold toward royalty?
9. Why has the German titled class so little influence?
10. How is the middle class in Germany affected by social ostracism?
11. What benefits to both classes would result from a removal of some of these barriers?
12. Why is class prejudice stronger in the North?
13. How has the poor aristocracy helped to create a united Germany?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Germany, Present and Past. S. Baring-Gould.

CHAPTER IX

GERMAN SOCIETY

Social intercourse cannot exist among honorable people without a certain sort of confidence; it must be common among them. Each should have a sense of security and discretion which never gives place to the fear that something may be said imprudently.

—*La Rochefoucauld.*

I

German society in its wider sense is a prism of many, but by no means harmoniously blended, colors. In few countries is the aristocracy of birth so cut off in social life from some of the best intellect of the land. Nowhere is intellect found so largely outside the circles of wealth and high birth, for German society, unlike the French, does not bow to talent alone. This distinct social feature is a result from within, for the tendency of the Prussian monarchy of late has been to recognize and raise the purely intellectual elements of the country even more than is done in England. But, whereas with us the recognition of brains is invariably followed by the social acceptance of its possessor's family, in Germany it stops short of womankind. In England a great professor is distinguished by royalty, and the aristocracy follows suit (if it has not preceded the recognition of royalty), and the upper middle classes follow in its wake, receiving and visiting the lion's wife and family.

In Germany this is far different. A great artist, a man of letters, an eminent man of science may be loaded with stars or appointed to high office; he will be readily received either in his personal or in his official character, but the aristocracy will not visit him, nor will the nobility visit his wife. His wife has no social status. She is not *hoffähig*, which means she is not qualified to be received at court, the test of social position in Germany. Even more, should she be of noble birth herself, and previous to her marriage have been presented to her sovereign, she forfeits this privilege on her marriage with a commoner; this in marked contrast to the English social law: "Born a lady, always a lady." These facts may seem of small importance to the casual observer, and yet they are accountable for much that is peculiar to German society. They are at the root of, and partly explain, the inadequacy of woman's social status in Germany.

In England undoubtedly, too, as well as in France and America, there is a definite line drawn between those who belong to and those who are outside the narrower pale of polite society. Still, it is not so patently an arbitrary distinction as in Germany. In fact, it does not carry with it the sting of its injustice and its irremovability; for in those countries there are few individuals who, by wealth and a sufficient amount of tact, or by tacking the sails, cannot hope to enter the charmed circle, whereas in Germany these barriers are almost insuperable.

It is not the mere presentation or non-presentation at court which marks the difference. The arbitrary exclusion of many of the most cultured women in Ger-

many narrows the circle of their social life, to which they naturally attach greater value than men, who are more actively absorbed in life's economic struggle. It causes German women to feel a kind of neglect, which in due course produces envy and jealousy. Thus in such circles we are often impressed with a tone of bitterness, if not of dislike, when the aristocracy, or even the crown, is mentioned. This feeling becomes doubly galling when the Germans see strangers admitted to their best society who have neither birth nor breeding nor brains to recommend them. For the nicety of perception of the German mind is often woefully at fault when dealing with foreign elements.

Insular assurance and American "shoddy" force the gates of the minor German courts. English half-pay military or naval captains—a refuse of the militia thrown in—sometimes with a growing family, living abroad for economy on a third-floor flat above a butcher's shop, go to court, and have been known to answer the addresses of royalty with their hands in their pockets. A shabby-genteel coterie of middle-class sweepings who are distantly related to half the peerage, and let you know it in and out of season; a poor, seedy, retired English diplomatist and his "good lady" ablaze with a Primrose League "jewel" and with the face of a cook in front of a Christmas joint—these are a few specimens of the foreign element in German society. For if refined natures are rare in any country, they are rarer still among the traveling representatives of a nation.

But such are the elements that push their way in

their own country, and, being admitted to court at home, can claim presentation abroad. Thus it is the fault of the Germans themselves if they make much of foreigners in society. Why don't they make more of themselves? For, as long as the Germans exclude the untitled of their own nationality, an English, French, or American commoner, who at home has no barrier but the limits of his self-assertion, will be rightly accepted in German society, for he has perhaps the requisite standing in his own country. He forces his way into German society now and then even when he has no home credentials to boast of.

This can only be remedied in Germany when the intellectual classes in possession of means come more to the front. Unfortunately, present circumstances are little calculated to fit German womankind for an enlarged scope of social duties.

II

Other social results can also be traced indirectly to this artificial barrier erected between the professional, scientific, and wealthy commercial classes on the one side and the nobility and royalty on the other.

The German aristocracy is limited to the intellectual life to be found within its circle, which is slightly sporadic. This state of things is disadvantageous to the aristocracy, besides narrowing its popularity, as shown elsewhere. The intellectual and wealthy classes are debarred from that contact with a certain urbanity and graciousness of manner, a deference to women, which still, whatever may be said to the contrary, is a

marked characteristic of the best German nobility. It is true that the excluded classes do their utmost to ape aristocratic manners, but, like all imperfect imitations, they lack finish and are liable to be overdone. This applies especially to German womankind.

The universities, the army, the public services are open to all classes alike, and there all Germans gain a certain cosmopolitanism of views and manners, which, if it now and then falls short of a standard which can only be attained in a highly refined family circle, yet compares fairly with that of similar classes in other countries. The German women of the middle classes, on the other hand, show the painful results of their social restriction in more ways than one. The feeling of their derogatory position begets, as aforesaid—though it be never so much denied—a latent feeling of envy and jealousy, which shows itself in excessive sensitiveness. This again, in its turn, is the ever-recurring cause of exaggeration of manner and want of tact. Thus intercourse with the middle classes is far more difficult than with the aristocracy. Their manners are exaggerated in their punctiliousness and exaction, and you can innocently tread on toes while you fancy that you are gaining golden opinions.

The middle classes are often exaggerated in their sensitiveness, and, besides that, are grievously given to ill-natured small-talk. Hypersensitiveness is one cardinal characteristic of German society, as it is a marked one of German character generally. A broader and more cosmopolitan horizon of social life could not fail to diminish, if not entirely to banish it.

To these facts may also be traced that want of

prestige in society which marks German women of the untitled classes. Contact with the highest society would soon show German women the consideration which their titled sisters enjoy, and which they would not be slow to strive for. Whether they would find the sterner sex ready to render it, or whether they would be able to wield the weapons that secure it, is another matter. The fact remains that, however well educated middle-class German women may be, they generally suffer from a pettiness of feeling and thought which is not calculated to make their lords bow down to them amidst the wear and tear of every-day life. And the proof of this is, that they do not succeed in being treated with that deference and regard in private life that ladies invariably meet with in the German aristocracy, as well as in the educated society of England, France, and America. Holding, as we do, that women should be the depositories of all that goes to make up and regulate the smaller amenities of social life, we cannot but deplore that the influence of some of the best German women is, in that respect, very restricted and limited.

Average Germans have a tendency to give way to their temper in dealing with the ladies of their family, which can only surprise those to whom it is a novelty. The countrymen of Schopenhauer do not often err on the side of too much consideration for the fair sex as such. If a person is unpopular, it seems only to add bitterness to dislike if that person be a woman. Some journalistic attacks on the Empress Frederick bear testimony to this. Such censors evidently think they are in the right, but they do not seem to incline to be

generous. It is indeed sad to note that slander, with regard to women, is easily set in motion and very prevalent in Germany. In fact, it reflects by no means a "nice" side of the national character.

The wide prevalence of the custom of spending daily hours and hours in beer-houses is not without its consequences in roughening German manners, particularly toward ladies, and encouraging the love of small-talk and gossip. It is not that Germans are not scrupulously polite in outward form toward ladies; it is in the intimacy of every-day life that they cast off too often those necessary little courtesies which mean so much.

Among other disadvantages, we think the beer-house tends to foster a forgetfulness that honorable old age is also a patent of nobility to be honored. And as a straw is sufficient to show the direction of the wind, it may be noted that smoking is indulged in in the presence of ladies to a degree which is hardly consistent with scrupulous regard for the fair sex. Even hard smokers will admit that the capacity of self-denial in this respect might now and then be legitimately called for. The average German almost never stops to think of self-denial in such matters. Custom has made him essentially egotistical in the trifles of every-day life, and a healthy female influence is not yet apparent to check him.

Fault-finding may be a thankless task, but those who feel that they are not blind to their own country's shortcomings may claim some excuse for dwelling on those of others. Still, if our national reputation on the score of social manners hardly places us on an undis-

puted point of vantage to decry others, we may quote the opinion of a Frenchman¹ who has shown a rare appreciation of Germany:

The German—unless belonging to the ideal race of great poets and thinkers—hardly knows the exquisite refinement of manner, the delicacy of pointed irony. When his heavy temperament enters into a discussion, strong words accompany his arguments, and they fall fast like heavy paving-stones. . . . Even genius does not always preserve them from these excesses, and three centuries of culture have not deprived the strong "table talk" of a Luther of its freshness and classicity.

Farther on:

The Germans, proud of their strength, show no sign of senility in their national life. Their failings rather tell of barbarism than of decrepitude; they offer a strange mixture of primitive coarseness and of civilization. The barbaric is in the blood; the superior and civilized nature is due to education.

A Frenchman may perhaps be more justified in using such strong language than an Englishman, for the nationalities of Latin race, withal, still retain a grace of manner, even in the humblest sphere, to which the Teuton as well as the Anglo-Saxon may well aspire in vain. Still, the subject of manners is a peculiar one. Much that is uncongenial to us in the manners of another people ceases to be so when we come to live among them and understand their ways and methods. Some of our own insular peculiarities, usually put down to want of consideration for others, are often the result of a certain shyness, which, once understood, generally reveals beneath the surface a far greater cordiality of feeling than that underlying continental

¹ "Les Allemands" (The Germans), by Le Père Didon. Paris, 1884.

scraping and hat-lifting. So, also, beneath the somewhat rough outward manner of the North German there is often far more fairness, if not generosity of sentiment, than is to be found among more readily "taking" nationalities.

Downright vulgarity is not often met with in Germany, but, when it is, it is far worse than in England. It is more often allied to intense sensitiveness combined with aggressive arrogance and *Rechthaberei*—the mental disease of feeling and asserting yourself to be always in the right. In England, even the most vulgar feel a certain nervousness and are cowed before birth and position; it is not so in Germany.

This brings us to the consideration of a German institution which, if not conspicuous for vulgarity, is not without a taint of barbarism—dueling. It is nurtured at the university, and is customary in all grades of German life, except the humble classes. Since the War of 1870 it has perhaps been on the increase, and only a few years ago, two schoolboys, of the respective ages of sixteen and thirteen, were had up before the court of justice in Stuttgart for fighting a most determined duel with pistols. They were both dangerously wounded. What can be said against dueling has been forcibly put by Schopenhauer in his essay on the meaning of honor, and his arguments are unanswerable—among them, that nations of such admitted virility as the Swedes, the English, and the Americans (now also the Russians) do without it.

That the "touchiness" of the German character encourages dueling is certain; also that the university authorities look upon it as a necessary means of incul-

cating a certain manliness. In this case, German youth would seem to stand at a disadvantage compared with the youth of those nations which possess manliness without it. Then, again, it is asserted by military authorities that dueling is necessary to the discipline of the army. If such be the sad truth, it must be admitted that in Germany it is not allowed to degenerate into bullying; it is kept within the narrowest possible limits, for no officer is allowed to fight a duel without previously asking the permission of the council of honor of his regiment, and an unprincipled duelist would soon, like Othello, find his occupation gone.

But whichever way we look upon it, it seems a pity that this barbarous custom should exist practically unrestrained, and be answerable for much sorrow and wrong in the country. For German duels (except those at the university) are anything but child's play. The middle-aged professional man, at the slightest insult, remembers his university days, and is ready to meet the fiercest military fire-eater with sword or pistol.

III

Leaving dueling out of the question, the above strictures must, of course, not receive acceptance without a due reservation and allowance to be made. Except dueling, they hardly apply at all to the best society of the wealthier cities of the empire, besides the former free towns of Hamburg, Bremen, Frankfurt-on-the-Main, etc. There we find the patrician burgher supreme, and with him all the peculiarities of his supremacy.

The days when the good Frankforters used to speak French in their social gatherings are past; also the ambition of the gilded youth of Hamburg and Bremen to pass itself off as English has undergone a slight transition. Nowadays the commerce-gorged types of Frankfort sun their dull features in the blaze of stars and ribbons earned in the dust and glare of battle, and feel themselves belonging to a great military nation, against the creation of which they literally raved and whined.

The social status of the well-educated and wealthy commoner in the above-mentioned towns, to which a few others might be added, is a far higher one than where he is overshadowed and left in the cold by a court and its military surroundings. In capitals such as Dresden and Stuttgart it is comparatively rare to see a civilian in the best society. Everywhere are glittering uniforms; sets that are patronized by the flower of cavalry regiments; others, more humble, that are content with the infantry, who hardly ever congregate socially; official balls, where the subaltern and the minor civil official have to dance with the gawky daughters of their superiors till they wish themselves away. Here the male element reigns supreme, but in the towns where there is no dominating court society the fair sex exercises a controlling social influence, although it has not always been employed as well as it might have been. Still, anybody who has mixed in the best society of these towns cannot have failed to notice the well-bred ease of manner of the ladies, and their high culture. With the possession of money there has grown a cultivation of the fine arts and a

great diffusion of the social amenities of life generally. These towns mostly possess a patriarchal oligarchy consisting of the wealthiest families, some of them with a history reaching back many generations. There is less distinction to be found between the titled and the commoner, and yet the petty spirit of cliques which is peculiar to social life in Germany shows itself even there, though in a special form. For the wealthy merchant citizen has a class pride of his own, which is not always justified by the small attention he pays to externals.

The wealthy citizen is deferential to the women of his family who have a knack of exacting deference. But he has often a bumptious hauteur and purse pride which put to shame the pride of birth of the noble with sixty-four quarterings. A class which in England is often known for its toadying to the aristocracy now and then shows bloated arrogance in Germany. The wealthy consul—here and there a generous patron of the fine arts, combining the culture of intellect with the manners of good society—is often an arrogant type of hard-headed counting-house life. Never so uneducated as some of our city magnates, he is far more arrogant and offensive. This arrogance is too often the veil under which he tries to hide his conscious social inferiority to the noble of the capital.

Although the wealthy Frankforter patrician will give you to understand that he is the equal of any count of the Holy Roman Empire, he is yet conscious that his equality exists only in his own imagination as long as he is within the four walls of his beloved father-town. He has a distinct knowledge that though

his daughters may receive the best society at home, they have only to marry a commoner in Berlin or Dresden or Munich in order to lose their social feathers and to be quietly relegated to a place outside the select circle. Thus the consciousness of his greatness is a very imperfect one, and, as such, shows all the drawbacks which imperfect convictions are apt to develop in the human breast. After all, the good German patrician town-folk are only human, and, as such, but the creatures of the petty character of their existence.

Berlin is the one town in the empire where untitled intellect has from time to time held a distinct and recognized social position, and, hand in hand with rarely cultured women, exercised a distinctly beneficial social, if not even a political, influence. The intellectual society between the years 1830 and 1860 in Berlin wielded more than local influence. Men such as Prince Puckler, Varnhagen von Ense, the Mendelssohns, Lassalle, and women such as Rahel Levin and others, left their stamp on the thought of their time. They inspired as well as entertained. The fare then offered was of Spartan simplicity, invariably only tea and small cakes, and yet in their hands society offered the only analogy to a French *salon* (*à la* Madame Récamier, or in our days, *à la* Madame Mohl) which has ever been realized in Germany. If these ideal conditions no longer exist, on the other hand some advantages remain to German cosmopolitan society which are worth noting. If, for example, you meet a man of note or exceptional position, you have not to run the gauntlet of a crowd of middle-class nobodies—

to steer through a miasmic atmosphere of sycophancy—in order to get at him. The German middle classes have not yet taken to lion-hunting and its vulgarizing accessories as a trade, an aim in life.

IV

In Berlin in recent years the Duke of Ratibor unites the *élite* of intellect and science under his hospitable roof. Countess Schleinitz until lately was a magnet that attracted and retained all that is eminent in the musical world. Postmaster Dr. Stephan receives the best of Berlin society, as also do from time to time all the other ministers. Prince Bismarck's receptions while he was in office were, of course, familiar to the world at large.

The late Professor Helmholtz occupied an exceptional position, and in his home he was the center of a circle which in the world of science could perhaps hardly be equaled for brilliancy outside the walls of Paris. Likewise the family of Mendelssohn has for generations past held a high social position in Berlin. From the witty contemporary of Frederick the Great downwards, this family has produced a succession of cultivated men and women. To-day the Mendelssohns are a center of polite and intellectual society in Berlin.

The wealthy plutocracy, here as elsewhere, cultivate the aristocracy of intellect and of the fine arts as a fashion, some vain vision of French *salons* of past days seemingly being the ideal they hopelessly strive to imitate. Besides the above, the wives of one or

two celebrities of the world of letters hold receptions which partake of a cosmopolitan character. They endeavor to weld or fuse into a homogeneous social stratum the many characteristic elements of which Berlin society is composed. The experiment is said to be fairly successful, but those who are best acquainted with them aver that a touch of bohemianism pervades the whole; an exaggeration of stilted forms in some, flanked by a somewhat boisterous abandon in others—the whole producing the impression of a spasmodic experiment that is not indigenous to the soil. For behind all these Berlin efforts at social intermingling stalks the proud typical figure of Lieutenant von Strudelwitz, who would be horrified if a celebrated musician or a literary magnate were seen in his house. To such as he—and he represents a distinct class—a man like Count Hochberg (brother of the wealthy Prince Pless) has soiled his escutcheon in accepting the superintendence of the various royal theaters, although by so doing Count Hochberg is in a position to influence the taste and culture of the public in as marked a manner as any six literary stars combined.

Lieutenant von Strudelwitz is a type whose ancestral leanings may be traced in the direction of Mecklenburg, in that favored duchy where, until recently, a mild form of the "cat," made of a good solid stick, now and then reminded the humbler inhabitants of the blessings of a patriarchal state of things. For there are even now authorities to be found who strenuously aver that the stick is not half so debasing as some of our more civilized forms of punishment. Lieutenant von Strudelwitz's social ambition is the membership

of the most exclusive club of the capital, the "Union," where gambling used to be indulged in by officers until young Prince William, now German emperor, one day prohibited it in decided terms.

In Major von K., until recently of the Alexander Guard regiment, quartered in Berlin, we have one of the finest types of the Prussian officer. He, too, is noble by birth, but not necessarily narrow in brain and sympathies in consequence. If he admires England, it is the history of England's greatness, the English character of energy, of manliness, which excites his admiration. He and his like invariably read, if not speak, English, and are pleased to remember that it was a Scotchman whose history of Frederick the Great is the standard work on his country's greatest king.

Although he loves his profession, which he considers one that ought to be above the temptation of money-making and petty personal ambition, he yet is able to recognize the worth and honor that can be sought and found in every walk of life, however humble. If you refer to the privileges the aristocracy possess in the army, he will tell you it is at most a preference they enjoy, which, if not deserved by constant and unremitting work and attention, only goes for nothing. He admits the prefix of *von* does sometimes confer a preference, but he does not boast of it, but rather seeks to excuse it by quoting the number of his ancestors and his relations who from time to time have shared the darkest days of Prussia's eclipse in the service of the state.

Except in some instances of self-asserting plutocracy, German society presents one particular negative

advantage. It is as yet comparatively free from that restless, vulgar cadging to be found in some countries. The toady, the tuft-hunter, the vulgar pushing matron, if not unrepresented, are almost non-existent. Not that human nature is different there from elsewhere. The conditions are healthier in this respect. German society offers little temptation to the vulgar who bow down to show and wealth; a toady would seek in vain a profitable return for his efforts; and lastly, rich heirs are too rare to reward the endeavors of intriguing matrons.

SUMMARY

The aristocracy of Germany is cut off from the best intellect, for socially Germany does not bow to talent alone. On one side are the professional, scientific, and wealthy commercial classes; on the other, those of the nobility and of royalty. One class loses contact with the better intellectual life; the other, with an urbanity and graciousness of manner. While society draws class lines more sharply than in any other country, it admits with comparative freedom even unworthy foreigners. Men of all classes may gain a certain breadth of view from the universities, the army, and the public service, but the German women, especially those of the middle class, show the results of their social restriction in their hypersensitiveness and want of tact. This same "touchiness" of German character fosters dueling, so largely prevalent in the universities and the army. The narrowness of the women is responsible, in some measure, for the lack of consideration and indifference on the part of the men.

Undoubtedly the frequenting of beer-houses has done much to roughen the national manners; but this rough exterior often hides a greater fairness than is sometimes found among more polite nations. In the wealthier cities, and in the former free towns, we still find the patrician burgher supreme, forming an oligarchy of the wealthiest historic families. In Berlin, intellect has had from time to time a recognized social position; the city affords numerous examples of the members of the aristocracy mingling socially with the untitled.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. What arbitrary distinctions exclude many talented people from German society?
2. How far does this apply to foreigners?
3. How do these conditions emphasize the native tendency to hypersensitiveness?
4. What view of dueling is held by the Germans?
5. How do social conditions in the wealthy towns differ from those in the capital cities?
6. How is Berlin an exception to the rule that untitled intellect has no social recognition?
7. Why is German society comparatively free from toadyism?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Germany, Present and Past. S. Baring-Gould.

CHAPTER X

WOMANKIND AND FAMILY LIFE

Willst du genau erfahren, was sich ziemt,
So frage nur bei edlen Frauen an.¹

—*Goethe.*

I

Tacitus—that supreme authority on the Germans of old—mentions in enthusiastic language their deference for their womankind. He also praises the German women for their severe chastity, in such striking contrast with the Romans.

Valerius Maximus tells us in reference to their chastity that the Teuton women prisoners begged victorious Marius to allow them to devote themselves to the service of their holy virgin Vesta, assuring him they would preserve themselves unstained like this goddess and her priests. In consequence of his refusal, they all strangled themselves in the following night. Bearing in mind the brutality of those times, the fierce passions and reckless life of the men, this trait of the chastity of the women stands out in bold relief, as also the honor paid to them. In fact, the veneration in which their women were held by the Germans runs right through history; it is met with in the Middle

¹ If you would know exactly what is seemly you need only ask the noble women.

Ages in the form of virgin worship, and also in the sentiment of the Minnesingers—the singers of love. It runs through German poetry down to the present day. It is true that in our matter-of-fact time a little poetry goes to the wall; but neither do we expect to find the heroic virtue of German vestals so ready to run to self-immolation as of old. Evil tongues have even been known to whisper that German women have not always had sufficient hatred for the enemies of their country to please their lords. In fact, many observers to-day fail to find that stern control of their feelings the old Roman historians credit them with. Perhaps the sickly kind of sentimental poetry of the last hundred years has had something to do with the development of demonstrativeness in German womanhood. However, no rule without an exception: the Germans of to-day are as loud as ever in praise of their womankind, and the testimony of a stranger may well be added to the chorus of praise. Madame de Staël, in her celebrated book "On Germany," says:

The German women possess a charm that is peculiarly their own—a sweet intonation of the voice; fair hair and dazzling complexion. They are modest, their feelings are true, and their demeanor is simple. Their careful education and the purity of mind that is natural to them combine to make up the charm they exercise.

If we may judge the intellectual capacities of a race by the history of its greatest men, so we can gauge the moral possibilities of a people by the character of its greatest and noblest women. In this sense the Germans may well be proud of their womankind. For although the Salic law has prevented them producing

rulers of the type of our Queen Elizabeth—except in the one splendid instance of Maria Theresa—yet women of German blood have before now played a giant's part in history. Empress Catherine of Russia was a born German, Princess Auguste Fredericke of Anhalt-Zerbst. She was a fine instance of the power of will and intellect, though she can hardly be said to stand as a model of female virtue. But German history shows a fairer figure than her in Queen Louisa of Prussia, the mother of the late Emperor William. In her were united all the noblest characteristics of German womankind; and her example, stirring the soul of an entire nation in her time, may be said to be one of the brightest prototypes for the Germans of the future to dwell on and to live up to. It has even been stated that, without the moral purification which Prussian society underwent through the bright example of her domestic life, it is hardly possible that the rising of Prussia in 1813 against Napoleon could have taken place. An author of the period says of her:

The consort of Frederick William III. was endowed by nature with everything that can be deemed charming in the sex. The fairest queen with a yet fairer soul: a whole woman in the words' deepest meaning. No wish to participate in the rule of her husband was in her character, only devotion to his person, nurtured by love, the purest type of innocence and high womanly modesty; such were the principal traits in Louisa's character, which were destined to form the happiness of the king and to be the model of a wife to the nation at large.

Another author like the one already quoted, a severe observer of mankind, Herr von Lang, in his memoirs, says of the queen:

She was in truth a woman who hovered like an ethereal being over us, in the form of an angel, with the sweetest persuasive powers, with which she cast the rays of her lovely nature around her, so that everybody was as if transfixed into a dream, charmed by this living, moving fairy picture.

This is high, yes, even extravagant praise; but it is fully borne out by every testimony of friend and foe, among the latter Napoleon and his councilor Talleyrand, who said of her: "I knew I should see a lovely queen; but I have seen the loveliest of queens and the most interesting of women."

II

Next to history, the literature of a country affords us a clew to the character of a nation's women. At least, its poets show us what its ideals are like. The heroines of Walter Scott, Richardson's "Clarissa Harlowe," and, above all, the glorious creations of Shakespeare, are heirlooms to the end of time to show posterity what English womanhood resembled—in its purest ideality, perhaps, the rarest union of tenderness allied to strength of character yet revealed to man.

A cursory glance at the German creations of fiction shows a marked difference from those of our country. No purer, no fairer types has literature created than those of Goethe and Schiller, yet they are distinctly German; they are different from our own. Our ideal women show an independence of character that is absent from the German type. The German figure of poetry enables us to understand the national boast that there is nothing like German *Weiblichkeit* (womanli-

ness). It is undoubtedly a splendid quality, and yet we cannot bring ourselves to consider its uniqueness as always synonymous with superiority to our own. Each type has its lights and shades, its strong as well as its weak points. But to our insular mind the German ideal is a little too self-forgettingly devoted, too slavishly worshiping, not to make us feel a lack of that strong individuality we find, for instance, in women of Slavonic race.

There is something in the German ideal of womanhood which bids us feel that their devotion, once given, leaves us no further fields to conquer. There is something in the English and Slavonic type which makes us feel it imperative not only to gain, but to retain, her devotion. Thus we are of opinion that English as well as Slavonic women hold their influence longer than their German sisters.

Goethe's Gretchen (in "Faust") is essentially German in her simple-minded purity, but even more so in her childlike devotion, and, later on, in her remorse. Of his Clärchen (in "Egmont") almost the same may be said. They cause us to feel that it must have been easy to gain the love of such simple natures, and that we should have esteemed them lightly accordingly. And yet it is just this blind, simple, childlike devotion, which looks up to an Egmont as a superior being, that has the greatest charms for the German lover.

It is interesting to note of Fredericke of Sesenheim, perhaps the sweetest of Goethe's characters—for she was a living reality—that it was her rural simplicity that cooled the poet, or at all events enabled him to tear himself away from her.

In Lotte (in "Werther's Sorrows") Goethe has given us another German type—the perfect housewife, cutting bread-and-butter all around. She is thoroughly honest and true to her husband, yet she leaves us with a suspicion that, if poor Werther had not shot himself, her friendship for him might have presented her with psychological doubts as to how she should reconcile it with her love for her husband.

If these female creations excite the admiration of the men, the lyric poetry of the nation has an inordinate influence over the budding female mind. In fact, poetic sentimentality often fills them with far too many illusions to meet the realities of life. For it is an instance of the strange double nature of the German character that, while their poetry is so sentimental, their conduct in daily life is in such marked contrast. Anybody can convince himself of this by a glance at the numberless advertisements with offers of marriage (*Heirathsgesuche*) which are to be found in almost every newspaper, not only at the present time, for the custom dates back over a hundred years. These productions are strangely matter of fact, sober, and sensible in tone, the principal points in request being usually a little money and domestic virtues of manifold description.

To our mind, German girls lack that freedom English girls enjoy; and, while the Germans are never tired of vaunting the virtue of their women, the slightest intimacy with the other sex, unless followed by immediate betrothal, is sufficient for gossip to lay hold of and discredit them. English women are said to be prudish, but in the art of feeling shocked Gretchen outdoes her English sister. At parties you can hardly

dance several times with a young lady, or show a little preference for her, without gossip at once busying itself with its being a case of engagement.

This is a great pity, and is one of the reasons girls are not brought up in greater independence of thought and character, and taught to look to their own energy as offering a possible career in life, outside wedlock. It is not only with us that women of the present day are often too anxious to get married to enable them to discriminate and choose wisely. On the other hand, we must admit that German girls are much less influenced by the hope of marrying money and position than the daughters of our well-to-do classes. This is all the more to their credit when we bear in mind that their men are much more anxious to marry money than our own.

The daughters of the poor aristocracy have a far greater horror of marrying beneath them than our aristocracy, for even money and luxury fail to overcome their traditional objection to trade. They will marry poverty in almost any form sooner than that. But, side by side with this prejudice, they possess the virtues of order and economy in a rare degree, and, as a class, they have contributed their share to the present greatness of Germany by being the mothers of the great majority of German officers.

III

While we, perhaps, carry too little sentiment into our every-day life, German women have a longing for more than they usually get, and it is one of their good

points that their disappointment rarely takes an aggressive form. They soon get reconciled to the reality, and make excellent wives and mothers. In fact, if only half-way well treated, no truer, no more dutiful or better woman can be found. She may not rise to that independence of thought and conduct we now and then meet in our own country, but neither are her faults colored by the qualities she lacks. If she be not noted for that sublime union of breadth and boldness of character added to womanliness we behold in some of Shakespeare's heroines, neither is she the fiery termagant, the secret drinker, to be met with elsewhere. Even if not particularly happy at home, her unselfish love of her family makes her submit to many things against which the women of other countries rebel, and instances of moral depravity are rarer than in almost any other country; for, if we are to believe tradition, Irish women in this respect carry the palm.

The circumstances of the German woman's life are not of a kind to produce those extraordinary instances of strong-willed initiative we meet with among English women. Her education is more homely, her life more restricted; the organization of German society does not give her a sphere of action such as many English women have found and shone in. Her life is comparatively uneventful, not to say monotonous, so that even her virtues, not to mention her shortcomings, are tinged with the idiosyncrasies of her surroundings. But if she is inclined to gossip, if she often exasperates her husband by her exacting pettiness, and fails to impress him with that tact or dignity which the French possess so preëminently, at the bottom

she is honest, self-respecting, and reliable to a rare degree.

It is only among the German aristocracy and plutocracy that we meet with anything like the independence of English women. Again, the women of the aristocracy are more cosmopolitan and less nationally typical than others. They are more free from the trivial qualities referred to above; but, although superior in manner, they do not show so high a percentage of happiness in married life. Where the women of the middle classes gossip and sulk, those of the aristocracy rebel and intrigue. Divorces are very common, and it is not unusual to meet half a dozen divorced men and women at evening parties in large towns. The faults of the middle class are trivial and on the surface; beneath it the body is healthy; and a little more self-control and attention to details of manner would considerably add to their sum of happiness. All in all, the average of married happiness seems to be higher in Germany than in England, and several conditions seem partly answerable for it. Of these, perhaps the most prominent are the longer duration of engagement, enabling a better prior mutual acquaintance; the later age at which Germans marry; and, lastly, the greater aptitude of average German women for household work and occupation.

In Germany the woman's place is at home; there she shines preëminent, self-sacrificing, devoted to her family. She is more domesticated than the women of any other nation. It must have been an ungrateful, dyspeptic German husband who invented the saying, "Women and dogs should be kept indoors."

Although in our days of luxury and pleasure-seeking the exceptions are many and daily increasing in number, yet, as a rule, German homes are centers of rare order, economy, and general comfort and happiness. And the words of Schiller still apply to the German housewife:

And therein reigns
The prudent wife,
The tender mother;
In wisdom's ways
Her house she sways,
Instructeth the girls,
Controlleth the boys,
With diligent hands
She works and commands,
Increases the gains
And order maintains.¹

And even more than that, for although German husbands do not grant their wives that equality of companionship we witness in England and America, yet they share more of their husband's interests than the wives of those countries, and in this more resemble their French sisters. If her husband be deficient in the small considerations of every-day life, yet he turns to her for advice and moral support in all matters concerning the education of the children and affairs of business. She is a true mother to her children, and wields an influence over them which is, perhaps, only met with again in France.

Rising almost as early as her servants, she sets them an excellent example; she superintends their work, is invariably an excellent cook herself, and finds her

¹ Schiller, "The Song of the Bell."

happiness in her home activity. Although she exacts more of her dependents than we are accustomed to do, yet she asks her servants to do little*she is not able and willing to do herself, although her education fits her for the society of the best. Even if her servants be poorly paid, and only too often meagerly fed, they are made to feel a greater interest in the family than is common in England, and family festivities invariably include a greater recognition of the domestics than in our country.

Hence her influence is decidedly beneficial on her dependents, the morality and happiness of whom are, we believe, above the average of the same class in England. That the circumstances of life are happier with them is seen by the few German servants that go to England who can be induced to stay, as high wages cannot make up for their isolation. The habits of thrift and industry and cleanliness of person and the sense of self-respect among them are very strong, and lead to their becoming the useful wives of the working classes later on. As such they are in every way far superior to the same class at home. It is very unusual for a German servant-girl not to have saved a snug little sum of money toward starting housekeeping, and it is nothing very unusual to find them enter the married state with a trousseau of linen worth over two hundred and fifty dollars. Thus, it is not surprising to find a far smaller percentage of the women of the lower classes engulfed in the pitiless waves of social ruin than in England.

If to our mind German wives may in many instances be considered little better than servants, on the other

hand, they hold that English women incline to luxury and laziness. There is certainly less of outward pretense in German families than in English, and a far greater percentage of people in the middle classes who live well within their income with something to spare.

But as everything has its drawbacks, so with the household work of the German wife. It is often the case that when you make your morning call and are told that the *gnädige Frau* (the gracious lady) will be with you at once, you have to wait half an hour till she appears; or the "gracious lady" has a headache, or is engaged at her toilet, which often means that she is so hopelessly involved in household affairs that she cannot receive you at all.

IV

Of German husbands, the poet Heine, in one of his vicious moods, said: "German married life is no true wedlock. The husband has no wife, but a servant, and he continues to live on in spirit his isolated bachelor life even in the family circle." We cannot agree with this, for in many respects the German husband is a model of a family man. He upholds the sanctity of the family tie in all its most important bearings, and as an anxious, conscientious father of his children he has few equals. Englishmen, who so often lose sight of their sons in their teens, can form little idea of the moral influence a German father exercises over his children, even after they have reached manhood. On the other hand, in the small matters of

every-day life, he is not always as appreciative of his consort's qualities as he might be. In fact, he is often unconscious of them, for, being brought up to expect so much, he has rarely the sad experience of what a curse a lazy, pleasure-seeking woman may become. And thus Bismarck's remark that "our wives are the only ladies we are rude to" has more than a passing meaning.

Notwithstanding the many ethereal qualities love-sick Germans credit their women with, once married they generally become wonderfully sober and matter of fact. They know they are the stronger, and except in rare cases of good breeding, do not scruple to show it when their sensitive nerves are irritated. They are slightly inclined to bully and domineer, and direct contradiction, such as "That is not true" (*Das ist nicht wahr*), is not at all uncommon, and is thought nothing of. Nor do they like to be told that they are often responsible for the petty weaknesses of their women. On the contrary, they are nervously anxious that their helpmates should behold in their august countenances the effulgence of Jupiter the thunderer, and recognize it to be their supreme function to serve and to obey.

There is a certain restlessness in the temperament of Germans that bids them devote much of their time to the exclusive society of their own sex, which they do in the beer-houses, of which the number and the extensive patronage is beyond belief. Germans of almost every position of life frequent these beer-houses, and those who are married invariably justify this habit by telling their indulgent wives that it is necessary for

the broader intellect of man to seek sweet converse and animation in the society of their own kind, that interchange of ideas is important to keep themselves abreast of the great questions of the day. Those who have enjoyed the privilege of German beer-house society are likely to hold a different opinion of the breadth and wealth of ideas that permeate the smoky atmosphere. However, the fact remains that German husbands spend more of their spare time in men's company without their wives than we do, and hence their women are much restricted to the company of their own sex. This is the more to be regretted when we bear in mind that the education of women in Germany is so excellent that it only requires such social fostering as they often seek in vain, in order to make their society the most interesting one could wish, ten times more healthy and entertaining than that of any beer-house. As it is, ladies' tea-parties, so-called "Kaffee Klatsch," restrict them to small-talk and petty gossip, and thus cause a want of breadth of view and feeling entirely unworthy of the excellent education they have received.

In this respect German husbands are often selfish, and rarely fight out that victory over their meaner nature by which an Englishman conquers his longing to spend an evening at his club, and submissively hurries home to a fireside, where he does not always receive an adequate welcome. For the male type of the silent sufferer (*der stille Dulder*) is much more common with us than in Germany. These remarks, however, apply more to the so-called better middle class; to the honor of the masses it must be said that their

wives share more of their company. In fact, they usually take their amusements, such as theater-going, country outings, beer-drinking, together. This, indeed, is one of the reasons why, though rather heavy drinkers, they so seldom get intoxicated. However humble the means, there are few workingmen's families that do not set aside a little week by week for common amusement.

We have dwelt on the typical shortcomings which, as everywhere, mark the majority. The exceptions are also distinctly typical, and nowhere reach a higher ideal of happy family life than in Germany. Here we find sympathetic feeling blended with rare breadth of philosophic education and culture, skill in the arts, and delicate tenderness of heart.

An illustration of this is brought near to us, and in the loftiest social sphere, as all know who have read the journals of our queen. The little touches therein contained of family gatherings at Christmas, and on other occasions, are quite in the ideal German spirit; no less than the prince's custom of allotting to each child a garden to be cultivated by its own hand, with the festival which was held when the products were by themselves cooked and eaten. This is simply an instance of the idea of the Prussian prince learning a trade applied to the female side.

The late Princess Bismarck was indeed one of those typical German women whose whole life was unremittingly centered in her family, her home. Those who enjoyed the privilege of her acquaintance and were permitted to visit at her home can never forget her kindness, her excellent qualities of heart and

mind. Few women in exalted station were less worldly or more simple of heart. Her devotion to her husband, her children, was truly German; it was unique. She lived only for them and their happiness.

SUMMARY

From the days of Tacitus the highest deference was paid to German women. Veneration for them runs through the history of the rough Middle Ages, and through German poetry down to the present. Germany has produced many powerful women, such as Catherine of Russia, Maria Theresa, and Queen Louisa of Prussia, a woman of the highest character and personal loveliness. Judged by literature, English women possess more independence than their German sisters, and require more from the men who would retain as well as gain their devotion. The greater freedom possessed by English girls is in a great measure responsible for their greater independence. While the wives of the German nobility enjoy considerable freedom, most German women live comparatively narrow lives. The woman's place is more in the home, which is usually the center of rare order, economy, and general comfort and happiness. Like the French women, they share their husband's interests more largely than do their English or American sisters, take upon themselves the personal direction of the servants, and treat them with consideration. The German of the middle class is often not so appreciative of his wife, is frequently irritable and domineering, and spends much of his spare time away from her, thus

depriving her of his companionship. Among the masses, however, there is greater companionship and a greater community of interests.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. What tributes has history paid to the worth of German women ?
2. How does the German ideal of womanhood differ from the English and Slavonic type ?
3. What customs reveal the lack of freedom enjoyed by German girls ?
4. What sphere does the married woman occupy in the middle and upper classes, respectively ?
5. How does the position of the German servant compare with that in other countries ?
6. How does the German husband adjust himself to family relations ?
7. What high ideal of family life, though exceptional, is also typical of the nation ?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Germany, Present and Past. S. Baring-Gould.

CHAPTER XI

THE PHILISTINE

Arrogance is a plebeian vice.

I

We have endeavored to describe qualities that excited the admiration of Carlyle and many others. It is but meet to point to shadows, if only to set off the light.

Those who have heard of the national self-sufficiency of the English after the battle of Waterloo, and those who can remember the truculent bumptiousness of the French chauvinist element after the Italian campaign of 1859, ought not to be surprised at any manifestation of national conceit in Germany after the victories of 1870. But it must be noted as one of the brightest sides of the German character that their best intellect seems to have remained wonderfully sober in the midst of intoxicating success. This is particularly the case in the army and in diplomatic circles, while here and there it is surprising to see a knot of university professors showing more of chauvinistic ardor than of calm philosophy. Even the occasional big words of a Bismarck have been invariably uttered with a purpose—as a means to an end. For though he has told us that the Germans fear only God, we know that they

fear a few other things besides—notably, social democracy and the Philistine spirit. We can remember the rebuke administered to a man of letters who thought that the Germans would beat the French again. “You must not say that,” remarked a high Prussian officer present; “that is in God’s hand.”

Unfortunately, this humility does not characterize the German Philistine, who is largely represented in the community. In him the Germans originally typified the small citizen class which has had no higher education; but his cast of mind is found to be present in other circles as well. His is that narrow, carping spirit, the existence and growth of which may be regarded as largely owing to the unhappy political condition of the past reacting on the weak sides of the national character.

German unity was never his ideal, nor has its attainment yet shown many signs of ennobling him. When the advantages enjoyed by other countries only served to instruct and urge on the efforts of Germany’s best intellect and character, the Philistine mingled his hatred (*Schadenfreude*) and envy with a cringing deference to foreign superiority; and when that did not suffice, he had a little of those qualities to spare for the best men of his own country. The speciality of hatred termed *Schadenfreude* is essentially a Philistine German quality, and is untranslatable. It means the gratification of pent-up envy—the joy over the misfortune of those we had previously cringed to and envied. It is allied to a craze for grumbling (*das Räsonniren*), which was ever a Philistine virtue. And yet, strange to say, while indulging in these feelings with regard to every-

thing around him, the Philistine has ever been the supporter of the old fossilized order of things.

When Aristides was being ostracized, an Athenian who did not know him, asked him to mark his shell for him. "What has he done to you that you should wish him to be banished?" Aristides inquired. "Oh, I am tired of hearing him called the Just," the Athenian Philistine replied. Neither does his German representative of to-day like to hear any one praised.

In his temperament the querulous rowdy is ready-made. Yet his is the nature that makes his countrymen ridiculous by prizing and bowing to empty titles, while true distinction is beyond his ken. He alternates between loud, aggressive arrogance and mean, cringing servility. To this class Goethe is a haughty aristocrat, and even poor Schiller a prig. Formerly he would sneer at Prince Bismarck as an unscrupulous political trickster, and to-morrow he may boast that Bismarck is, after all, only the mouthpiece, the exponent of the ideas of such as he. Yesterday he ridiculed the idea of the Germans presuming to beat the French, and to-day he talks of his countrymen ousting the English from South Africa. A trait of his fretful sensitiveness leading to arrogance was illustrated the other day, when one of the fraternity received a communication from the imperial law courts at Leipzig in which he was merely addressed as "well-born," whereas he thought that the title of "high and well born" was his due. He immediately stigmatized the omission as a "colossal want of tact," and paternal government, with an Argus eye for its own dignity, was not long in

returning the compliment in the form of a fine of thirty dollars, or twelve days' imprisonment.

Another opposite manifestation of the Philistine spirit, well known and tolerated in other countries, has hardly done more than show its cloven foot in Germany. It did so at the accession to the throne of the present emperor, when the court shopkeepers of Berlin tried to present an address emphasizing their loyalty and devotion. Luckily, the attempt to gain signatures fell very flat; so that we may well hope this insidious form of arrant Philistine flunkysm will not take root in Germany.

II

The patriotism of the Philistine is of a peculiarly aggressive and arrogant kind, yet windy and empty for all that. It has not even the misdirected concentration of French chauvinism, for indifference is mingled with hatred and conceit. From this indifference, indeed, arises the fact that he is not impressed, much less carried away, by military glamour; he only suns himself in it, as a cheap form of patriotism. He speaks of the English as a nation of shopkeepers, yet conveniently forgets that no part of Bismarck's policy has earned such unqualified approval in the Fatherland as his endeavor to compete with the English as traders beyond the sea.

The Philistine meets his boon companions in the beer-house, and will enlarge on the enormous strides German commerce has made of late, being able to laugh at English competition, etc. He probably is not aware that the Germans still fail to outdistance

the English, but he forgets what he ought to know and remember—that a good many branches of German trade would often have been in a sad plight if it were not for those very English who supplied them with orders. While, on the other hand, almost every English manufacturer's product is kept out of the German market—or at least severely handicapped—by strong protective tariffs, which conveniently assist the Teuton in competing successfully.

The Philistine boasts of the enterprising spirit of German commerce, whereas the principal "enterpriser" in Germany is the state, whose competition in many ways cripples the initiative of the individual.

He rides home from his favorite beer-house in a tramway car, started and financed by an English company—for several of the German tramways were started by English enterprise and capital.¹ When he reads that the English company has sold the concern at a good profit, and it has been taken over by local capitalists, he reviles the sordid instincts of the English and is disgusted at the huge profit they have made out of the poor Germans. Yet when this amiable individual insures his house or his life, the chances are he will do so with an English company, although the German institutions are perhaps to be preferred.

A favorite war-horse of the Philistine is his hatred of the Jews—a hatred based on envy, because the Jews succeed where he makes but a poor shift. Macaulay said that the Puritans hated bear-baiting, not because of the cruelty to the bear, but because of the pleasure given to the spectators. The German Philistine feels

¹ As also were formerly many German gas companies.

much in the same way. He would fain be rich. He dislikes the Jews because they are rich. And yet the chances are that the Philistine will even take his daily opinions from a Jewish paper, and vote for a Jewish town councilman or member of Parliament. He will even at a pinch employ a Jewish lawyer and call in a doctor of the Hebrew persuasion; in fact, it throws a lurid light on the helplessness of the Philistine that the Jews—a foreign but homogeneous element—have gained such ground in the midst of them, notwithstanding all such hatred.

III

Such is the inconsistency of the German Philistine; and yet, in the aggregate, he is a powerful animal for harm. He has given Prince Bismarck a lot of trouble in his time. He actually chuckled with delight in those days when the great man was irritated by the venomous onslaughts of Liberal orators. To-day he gloats over the discontent of the working classes as evidenced by the spread of social democracy; he loves to exaggerate it and to foretell the ruin of the future. He does not know that the narrow-minded apathy and incapacity of his class are in part responsible for the growth of what he deplores. It is in part owing to his want of stamina and national feeling that the Social Democrats have had such easy play. In fact, the Philistine petty middle class is already being gradually absorbed by the Social Democrats; for many Philistine characteristics have found a congenial field in the new movement: one in particular, the gospel of hate.

When imperial measures are proposed which seem to curtail the privileges of his own petty sovereign, he rails and throws himself in the breach, or, more literally, buries his head in his beer-mug and mutters his imprecations at Prussian arrogance. Not that his meager loyalty will hold water, for in his own narrow circle he is the life and soul of opposition to the powers that be. He hates and detests the "beggarly" aristocracy, and sneers at its pretensions to refinement. And at the bottom of it all there is a sneaking fondness for the Austrians, and even for the French; for until lately there was a Chinese wall of Philistinism between Prussia and some of the other states, where even to-day patriotism is yet a sickly plant.

Bismarck is reported to have once said, "Germany is being ruined by the beer plague," and beer is indeed the spirit that inspires the Philistine, the beer politician *par excellence!* It nourishes his envy. He wonders how much money his neighbors are making. If he hears that one of them is in the habit of having hot suppers at home, he spreads the report that he is living beyond his means. If he thinks the proprietor of his favorite beer-house is making too much money, this also is apt to disagree with him, and he and his boon companions will suddenly transfer their patronage to the opposite side of the street, in order to show mine host that, although he may have taken their money, he is nobody after all. If anything irritates the Philistine more than the knowledge that anybody is making money, it is to have to admit the political success of an opponent. When a German member of Parliament told Bismarck that German unity had fallen

like a ripe fruit into his lap—when Windthorst, the great Catholic parliamentary leader, told Bismarck that it was easy to do what he had done, with the Prussian army at his back—that sentiment found a ready echo in the Philistine heart throughout the Fatherland.

Slander is the favorite pastime of the Philistine, and the smaller fry of local lawyers are supported by the endless despicable quarrels which boil up and overflow out of the caldron of hate into the public press. German laws against defamation of character are so vexatious, and at the same time so inadequate, that although you can hardly say an unkind thing of a neighbor without being liable to pay a fine of three marks (seventy-five cents), yet you can indulge in a cataract of invective and insidiously endeavor to ruin a person's character, and the law is almost powerless to afford adequate protection to the slandered; for the Philistine originates as well as propagates slander. This state of things suits the temperament of the Philistine, whose delight is to serve out his neighbor in a mean, contemptible spirit. Thus, you can hardly turn over the leaves of the smaller provincial papers without "apologies" and "retractions" of the flimsiest kind meeting your eye. A common form is the following: "Herewith I withdraw my slanders against X, and warn everybody against circulating them any further." We translate the following three notices from the columns of a single number of the leading Saxon newspaper:

Declaration of Honor.—I regret the insults that I gave expression to, under excitement, with regard to Messrs. Naumann, hotel-keepers, in Leutewitz.

A. O. SEIFERT.

We herewith withdraw the insulting remarks made by us with regard to Mrs. Ida Schetel, *née* Schulze.

(Signed) · R. BÖHME.
H. BÖHME.

L. Hoenig herewith withdraws the vilifications expressed by him with regard to the —— Club.

In Germany it cannot be said, “*De minimis non curat lex*”;¹ also, it is to be deplored that the comparative cheapness and leniency of the penal laws pander to the Philistine and other vicious instincts. The law, to our idea, attacks the individual too readily in trivial prosecutions, and in serious offenses its punishments are not severe enough. In this, there is too much humanitarianism. A form of crime very common in Germany—stabbing (often with fatal results)—is treated far too leniently. The policy of hanging a few offenders to discourage the others would be efficacious.

The founders of German unity are under no illusions as to the dangers to which their labors are still exposed from the spirit of hatred, of envy, and of dogmatic obstinacy in the Philistine. They fear it more than French battalions and Russian Cossacks. And well they may. It is widespread, and although not particularly demonstrative at present, it is by no means extirpated, much less powerless for harm in the future. It is doubly dangerous, as it appeals even to intellectual men on their weakest side—their vanity. Such an instance, already cited, is that of an eminent German professor, of European reputation, the strong advocate of a great and powerful Germany, who hurried off to Italy in a fit of the sulks when once it came

¹ The law does not concern itself about very small matters.

to be, merely because his vanity was wounded that it had not come about in his scholarly fashion. Men of this stamp are prone to hold forth on the sanctity of moral conviction, but fail to see the line that separates this quality from an exaggerated sense of stubborn dogmatism and vanity. German vanity is a very different thing from French vanity, but it is none the better for that. If Bismarck had been possessed of more vanity, he would have also shown more consistency of the kind that passes current with the Philistines—the consistency of obliquity and greenness of vision.

Those very elements in Germany that were most obstinate in opposing Bismarck's plans are now the ones which are constantly lauding everything German, and rending the air on festive occasions with their appeals to every German virtue. A German steamer is wrecked in the Red Sea, and aggressive newspaper articles hasten to reassure the public that such disasters will not influence the "civilizing" mission (that bit of French prostitution of language) Germany has over the seas. We have even heard it soberly stated that the German language is rapidly gaining ground in the United States! Such talk is not natural to the hardy Pomeranian or kindred men of arms, whose broken bones have furnished the cement of unity. Such stuff has been gleaned from the cosmopolitan braggarts of other countries, and finds parrot-like currency among German Philistines. It has not even the merit of originality.

The Germans who go to the United States lose their national individuality, and that, together with their

working capacity, goes to swell the great aggregate of the English-speaking race there. Alas, for the vain hopes of the Philistine! Bismarck knew this, as he knew most other things—notably, the peculiarities of the German Philistines. He knew that, side by side with the great qualities of the nation, there lurked a good portion of paltry egotism in public as well as in private life. He was the one great man of his time who dared to tell his countrymen of their failings. We know of no other public man in any country who has had similar courage. But he could do it, and they had to hear it, for they knew that they could not bluster and intimidate the man of iron. And many liked him all the better for this. They instinctively felt that he had earned the right to tell them the truth, though they were loath to admit it.

The late Emperor William, as well as Bismarck, felt that the social evils of the age will not be met by appeals to the Philistine spirit, much less by any initiative from that quarter. This is why they strove to take the initiative, an act for which so many doctrinaires condemn them. Whether it will succeed, the future will show, but it only wants an acquaintance with the Philistine to understand the attempt being made.

IV

Although the Philistine is a coarse animal, he is yet a very sensitive one. For although education is supposed to refine outward manners, it is mainly owing to the Philistine influence that we meet coarseness and arrogance allied to a high standard of book education

in Germany more than elsewhere. An average Englishman will stand any amount of censure if he sees at the outset that he is in the wrong. Somehow common sense tells him *that* is the main issue, and the censure merely a natural consequence. Not so the German Philistine: you must not trespass on his sensitiveness, be he never so much at fault; you must remember his dignity. Thus it will not surprise us to learn that the Philistine is devoid of humor. Over-sensitive people never have any humor. True humor is good-natured and does not mind being the subject of laughter. In his soft moments he is sensible to lyric poetry, especially of a sickly, namby-pamby kind. In fact, it must have been a German Philistine recovering from one of his fits of the lyrical blues who invented the national proverb, "In money matters there is an end of sentiment," a sober, utilitarian dogma, which cannot be surpassed in the works of the late John Stuart Mill or of Professor Clifford.

But over practical utilitarianism the Philistine cannot afford to lose sight of the "ideal," so he has initiated a crusade against the use of foreign words in the language. Everything foreign must be extirpated root and branch! This would seem less unnatural were it not that, until yesterday, the Philistine would have hailed the French or Austrians with open arms if they had come and given the Prussians a thrashing. But that was yesterday! To-day even the French language must be tabooed, and, if possible, discarded. A congress of card-players is held in Leipzig, and although it hesitates to banish "all" foreign denominations from the popular game of scat, it yet decides to do

away with every term of French origin. Naturally, such crazes find no footing in the army, where many denominations are French. In fact, a German army corps is a mighty German creation, although the name is French.

The recognition and adaptation of what is foreign is a two-edged sword. It may be a sign of mental breadth, but it is likely to go too far; with the Germans it has often verged on the ridiculous. The opposition of the Philistines to the use of the French language will not instantly obliterate that fact. They are the people who until lately would accept nothing indigenous without 'strong reservations of "ifs" and "buts," while often taking a worthless article unquestioned if guaranteed English or French.

That the preference for what is foreign has been a great failing of the Germans is undoubted. The intelligence of Germany has endeavored to derive benefit from its attention to foreign matters, whereas the Philistine has learned nothing but the cheap art of ranting in unison with the beer-house cry of the time.

V

The far-sighted genius of Germany foresaw that the French would sooner or later endeavor to obtain the left bank of the Rhine. The Philistine saw nothing of the sort: he would even have preferred the rule of Louis Napoleon to the hegemony of Prussia. But Germany's leaders knew even more than that: they knew that, once the French gained the left bank of the Rhine, it would not take long to make it French.

The left-bank Philistine would not have taken long to assimilate; are there none living now who still remember the French sympathies on the left bank of the Rhine long after 1815? But God willed it otherwise, and to-day the Philistine on the banks of the Rhine is strictly German, and as such is at liberty to impair his digestion and to muddle his brain with his mixture of beer and cheap patriotism.

The late Lord Lytton praised the Germans as critics. No wonder they have become celebrated in that capacity, for have they not one-half of the critic's functions—the quality of detraction ready-made—in the Philistine?

SUMMARY

The better German intellect has remained sober even in the midst of intoxicating success, but this humility does not characterize the German Philistine. He is a narrow, jealous, grumbling fellow, and withal a deep-dyed conservative. His patriotism is particularly aggressive and arrogant, yet empty and boastful. While reviling other nations, especially England, for their commercialism, he at once seizes every advantage that commercialism offers him. He hates the Jews, largely on account of their success where he has failed, but when it seems to his advantage he uses them. This Philistine spirit delights in opposing the government and has caused it much trouble. A paltry egotism lurks in public as well as in private life. The beer-houses are the special resorts of this class, and here they find pleasure in abusing the government and in slander. Although the German laws against the

defamation of character are severe, they are thoroughly inadequate. Be the Philistine never so much at fault, he resents vigorously any trespass upon his sensitiveness. He is unstable; at one time ready to hail France or Austria as his deliverer from Prussia; and again assailing them in the name of a united Fatherland.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. What are the general characteristics of the German Philistine?
2. What is his attitude toward foreigners, and especially toward the Jews?
3. How does he work harm to the state?
4. Illustrate his power to injure by slander.
5. How did Emperor William and Bismarck meet the Philistine spirit?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Germany, Present and Past. S. Baring-Gould.

CHAPTER XII

COMMERCE AND MANUFACTURE

*Nil sine labore.*¹

I

There can be no doubt that the manufacture, export, and general consumption of German goods has increased enormously, in one steady rising tide, say for the last fifteen years. But quite as interesting as these undoubted facts are some of their causes, and with regard to these very hazy notions seem to exist. It is not that England no longer alone possesses the qualities that made her merchants and manufacturers the greatest of the globe; it is not that the mantle with these qualities has suddenly fallen on the shoulders of Germany, or that technical education, or that state assistance, or that protective tariffs, or cheap labor, either are, in themselves, the only causes of this high tide of German commerce, though they all undoubtedly have something to do with it.

The fact is, the conditions of trade have changed almost as completely as has the method of traveling since the introduction of railways. The spirit of enterprise, which was long England's monopoly, has spread all over the world. The earnest honesty which delights

¹ Nothing is gained without labor.

in producing the best possible article as a matter of pride is hers still; the commercial aptitude in subdividing and controlling labor is hers still; the splendid machinery in all branches of manufacture is also hers still;¹ but these are no longer, as formerly, her monopoly. We have had too good a time of it in the past; we have been commercially spoiled, and hence have little experience of the trouble and effort it requires to wrest a market from the grasp of a rival who has hitherto monopolized it. This task the Germans have had. Other nations, and especially the Germans, doubtless assisted by their excellent technical schools,² have learned from us, and as a consequence our supreme advantages under these headings, in the past, have gone from us, possibly forever.

That all this means a comparative retrograde movement there can be no doubt. That is to say, although our returns increase, they do not increase in the same proportion as those of other nations, who up to yesterday showed no export trade worth enumerating. This state of things has been held up both here and in Germany—here by alarmists, and in Germany by enthusiastic optimists—as meaning that the days of our commercial and manufacturing superiority are over. Nothing could be farther from the truth, as a little insight will tend to show.

¹ This is only true to a certain extent to-day. In many branches of manufacture the machinery in Germany and also in America is far ahead of that in use in England.

² Not only their splendid colleges (*Polytechnikum*) for teaching engineering, chemistry, and physical science applied to commerce call for mention, but also their art-industry schools (*Kunstgewerbeschulen*). These are most numerous in the South, where in towns such as Frankfort, Nuremberg, Carlsruhe, Stuttgart, Pforzheim, Hanau, these schools have contributed to an extraordinary development in designing, and particularly modeling, a specialty English skilled workmen are most deficient in.

To begin with, material advantages alone do not make a great commercial nation, or Austria and Spain or Turkey might be on a level with England, and the Germans would be nowhere. Breadth of character and conception count for a great deal—in fact, are inseparable from great commercial enterprise. All great commercial communities of the past have possessed a backbone of strong, far-seeing character.

The lack of that daring necessary to successful trade is noticeable among the Latin nations, who have not the boldness to throw a sixpence out of the window in order that a shilling may come in at the door. Neither do they possess, in the same degree as the Germans and English, the discipline and character which are necessary to control labor. Hence these nations do not excel in the production of manufactured goods; and even in France it is peculiar to note how many great manufactories are owned by names of German origin.

In this particular the Germans are rivals England has every reason to take note of, but that does not say that they are likely to supplant her, notwithstanding their excelling in the production of medium-class goods. In the meantime, our sudden newspaper panic has provided them with an excellent advertisement wherever newspapers are read. Some people aver that even now there are very few items the Germans produce which do not owe their latest improvements to English or American ideas.

II

We are aware that German commerce has invaded many domains hitherto more or less English, but that is far from showing that they are equal or on equal terms. This we doubt. Even up to the present day it is an open question how far they would be able to compete, if excellence of quality and cheapness were the only things in request. Unfortunately for us, they are not always the only points to be considered, and that brings us to the main explanation of Germany's success in foreign trade; it is to be sought and found not so much in the cheapness as in the superior "adaptability" of the German as a producer. As a German has ever been apt to lose his nationality and adapt himself more readily to the country of his adoption, so also in his manufacturing produce he has a greater talent for adapting his wares to the demands and taste of the hour than the more conservative Anglo-Saxon.

It is not cheap labor alone that can explain the latest trade successes of the Germans,¹ for there are departments in manufacture in which our home production has been partly ruined by countries where labor is far dearer than in our own. Witness the depression in the English watch trade, caused not by cheap German articles, but by the importation of American watches. The Swiss themselves were, it may be remembered, being beaten out of the field by

¹ The truth of this statement has been since abundantly demonstrated by the different English trade commissions, which, from time to time, have visited Germany and found wages in some special trade even higher than in England.

the United States until they adopted the American system of manufacture. Does not England take her sewing-machines from America still, although the Germans in their own protected country are supposed to manufacture a much cheaper kind? Yes, it is the English race—not so much the Germans—which in America often shows a greater skill in the utilization of labor-saving contrivances and control of skilled workmen than at home. Among the advantages the Germans possess, cheapness of their labor must certainly be noted, but we must not forget their excellent technical schools, nor, above all, their adaptability in applying their skilled knowledge to the changing demands of the market.

One branch of trade in which the Germans have made extraordinary progress is the manufacture of pianos.¹ The most expensive and elaborate pianos in the world are made in New York, and the Germans have not been slow to adopt the mechanical improvements one by one as they appeared in America. Possibly many of them were the inventions of hard-working German mechanics in New York; in every case there can be no doubt that the Germans lost no time in casting the framework in one piece, and adopting one after the other all the little mechanical improvements that go to make the best pianos what they are.

During all this time most of England's conservative piano-makers have been content to revel in the unctuous satisfaction of being the happy possessors of the

¹ According to the *Cologne Gazette*, 7,500 German pianos, and only 900 English ones, were sold in Australia in 1877.

richest market in the world. They allow heavy trade discounts to fashionable musicians who recommend their pianos and negotiate a sale, and in the meantime the grand pianos of Bechstein, Blüther, and others have come over and invaded the concert rooms, and divided honors, to say the least of it, with those of English make.¹

Textile industries supply another instance of the formidable character of German "adaptability," which is the more remarkable, bearing in mind England's former supremacy. The textile industries are, moreover, the better suited to the Germans, as they enable them to avoid one of the disadvantages to which German labor is said to be specially exposed—namely, the tendency to produce inferior goods. In textile industries the supply can be strictly regulated by the demand. The plant of machinery is always, thanks to the excellent technical education in Germany, the latest and the best. With it can be produced the simplest and the most expensive and best goods, immaterial whether the works are situated in Barmen or Crefeld, or on the Polish frontier, where we have seen the finest wool spun by means of a plant that came from Mühlhausen in Alsace.

And this is done in such towns as Crefeld, Barmen, and Elberfeld, which send tons upon tons of goods to England and her colonies. Cotton and woolen braids, silk and cotton galloons, bindings for tailors, Italian cloth, etc., all find their way to English shores at the expense of Manchester and other towns. They

¹ In the last nine years German pianos have practically conquered the English home and colonial markets.

almost monopolize the Chinese market with their medium quality of Italian cloth and satin de Chine. This, not so much because they are cheaper, as because they are quicker and more dexterous in fitting their supply to the changing demands of the markets.

While English carpet manufacturers continue making the old-fashioned so-called Brussels, Axminster, Wilton pile, styles, and patterns, the German manufacturers, quickly discerning the modern taste for oriental carpets, make excellent and cheap imitations of the latter, and send them over to England. In woolen, flannel, cotton, and silk goods the same quickness of adapting the article to the requirements of the day is noticeable, whereas English makers are often too conservative to make a pattern at variance with the character of their stock. It is very rarely English makers can be induced to make a special pattern to suit foreign trade: it does not pay them, they say. The Germans do it readily. The advantage they reap in this respect is very noticeable in transoceanic trade. Our consular reports teem with instances to prove this.

The British consul at Paramaibo tells us:

The importation of hardware goods is, on the whole, satisfactory to British trade, but Germany is pressing very close on the heels of Sheffield by the production of wares which, being cheaper, are also not as serviceable, but are so polished, painted, and put up as to please the eye, and the difference in price leads many of the people in this colony to buy these goods in preference to the more durable English manufactured goods. Merchants would do well to look to the manner of placing their goods. A card of German scissors, cheap, and of the poorest material, nicely placed on a pretty card, and hung up in a shop window, will attract attention, while the better and higher

priced English article, done up in a brown paper parcel and put away on a shelf as not being an article for exhibition in the window, will lie for years unsold.

This accuracy in "measuring the market" brings us to note the great assistance German commerce derives from the action of the government and its officials. A government which we are taught to believe is only intent on turning its subjects into soldiers in reality strains every nerve to assist the foreign trade of the country.

We have been informed that when the Chinese ambassador went to Berlin, even Bismarck himself "condescended" to try and influence him to place a large contract for steel rails with a German firm.¹ And the inventor of steel rails, Sir Henry Bessemer, although a born German, lived in our midst!

Although the Germans until a very recent date hardly possessed a shipping-yard that could turn out a first-class ocean-going passenger steamer, they compete with England successfully as goods and passenger carriers. This is perhaps the most striking instance of all of their talent for "adaptability." They order some of their ships on the Clyde, and gauge so well what they require that their newest American liners can hold their own, if not even outdo the best of England's in speed.²

¹ Since this was first written the Chinese government has also ordered war-vessels in Germany.

² Since this was first written the Germans build their own warships as well as their passenger steamers. The *Kaiser Wilhelm der Grosse* is one of the largest and finest vessels afloat, and the tonnage of the North German Lloyd's in 1897 the largest of any shipping company in the world, not even excepting the English Peninsular and Oriental Company, which is paid a subsidy of over \$1,500,000 a year for carrying the English mails.

III

Thus the capacity or genius of "adaptability," combined with an extraordinary concentration and earnestness of purpose, which ever shows itself down to the meanest details of commercial life, is one of the most striking causes of recent German commercial success. It is a quality that strikes the more readily when we bear in mind that some great nations seem to be singularly destitute of it. The Italians, it is true, have of late shown great commercial energy, and many branches of manufacture have sprung up and adopted English, French, and German methods and models where they used formerly to rely almost solely on importation or inferior home-made articles.

But the French are an instance in point of a great producing country that rarely goes out of its way to seek models or ideas beyond its frontier. Subversive in politics, the French are wonderfully conservative in trade. They are patriotic to the degree of hardly seeming to wish even to profit by foreign enterprise. Their mission is to propagate their own specialties of manufacture as it has long been their privilege to promulgate their pet theories. Herein the French are in marked contrast with the Russians, who possess the capacity of adapting and assimilating to a remarkable degree. Although yet in their infancy as producers, another generation or two will reveal their powers of rivalry.

Not only in the quality of commercial adaptability is to be found the explanation of Germany's success. The patronage and support of its government, so

strange to individualists, we have referred to; the thorough commercial education of its merchants, its clerks, and the careful training and superior education of its workmen, supply us with additional evidence. Besides a complete theoretical commercial training, German clerks in their own country usually speak French and English, and a great number of those who come abroad have mastered Italian and Spanish as well. German merchants are to be found all over the world, taking rank beside our own. The training of their clerks can be seen in the city of London, where they oust the native element.¹ They are distinguished by sobriety, industry, and intelligence, and make these qualities imperative in those who would compete with them. This is the case particularly in England and the United States, and is becoming more so in South America, Japan, and in the English colonies every day.

In these points England is at a disadvantage; as in thrift, hard-plodding commercial training, not to mention the knowledge of foreign languages, our commercial classes are distinctly inferior to theirs. We are thoroughly alive to the excellent qualities of the much maligned British workman, but his defects and disadvantages tell more against him and us now than before.

We do not condemn trades unions; in a country believing in the gospel of Manchester they were an iron necessity of self-defense, but their conservatism and the obstinacy of their policy, by which they oppose every innovation, have often done us more harm than their demands for high wages. Also the want of thrift,

¹ The great proportion of foreign (mostly German) firms in the city of London is well known, and is in so far explained by their close attention to business.

of self-respect, inseparable from the lower education and meaner social standing of the British workman, handicap us sadly, though this is being improved. These items go a long way toward nullifying other advantages we undoubtedly possess. We think it was the late Mr. Brassey who gave it as his opinion that the British workman more than earned his higher wages by the greater value of his labor. That may still hold good of unskilled manual labor, but in all kinds of labor which are influenced by education and by the moral character of the workmen, our workmen cannot claim any superiority, either over Germans, French, or Italians.

From the foregoing it will be readily understood that the cry for technical education, which we hear on all sides, will not suffice to counterbalance many of the advantages over us the Germans undoubtedly possess. But, even bearing these in mind, we think the notions that prevail in Germany with regard to their latter-day commercial achievements are exaggerated ones.

IV

In general, it may thus be said that a certain lack of originality of taste and production in commerce goes hand in hand with their skill in adapting the ideas of others, if the one be not actually an outcome of the other. It is not likely that they will be found to agree with this statement, but it is one that can be thoroughly proved, over and over again. Their new patent laws, which are excellent, provide efficient protection for their ideas, and yet we seldom come across

a patented practical (*i. e.*, commercial as distinct from scientific) invention in Germany which does not turn out to be of English or American origin.

The sudden prosperity, or rather habit of money-spending, which set in after 1870 caused a great increase of production everywhere, but brought forth little taste and almost no originality. Everybody went back to the past for models—to the Middle Ages for metal work, in which the Germans ever excelled; and to the periods of renaissance and rococo for many other branches of production. There was certainly some explanation for this turning to the past. It was a time of national excellence in art industry. Yet even in those days the good Germans were slavish copyists of the Italians, except, perhaps, in the one solitary instance, when Marc Antonio (Raimondi) pirated the engravings of an Albrecht Dürer. But this gleaning from the past did not stop half-way and adapt itself to modern requirements. It often became ridiculous by slavishly reproducing the old angular, unpractical designs of bygone ages.¹

Assisted by their excellent trained designers, the Germans have made great strides in the manufacture of furniture. Also the importation of French furniture—a large business formerly—has almost entirely ceased, whereas the Germans now export largely to France and elsewhere. Their success in this, as in several other trades, has been assisted by the many German skilled workmen who were in Paris before 1870, and have since returned to their own country.

¹ Architecture must be excepted from the above strictures. Here, as elsewhere, where the greater trained artistic faculties come into play, the Germans generally excel.

Leaving out the fields of science as before mentioned, we are of the opinion that, besides want of originality, the German possesses little practical ability or taste as a producer.¹ It is very rarely you meet with an article in Germany that is practically fitted for the end in view. A glance at the German pottery trade will bear this out, for even their excellent schools for designers have not as yet been much use to them in this branch of production.

Although Germany was the first country in Europe in which china was made, it has long been distanced in its production by France and England. Meissen, the oldest manufactory in Europe, with all the prestige of royal origin and royal initiative, has done little else than live on an old reputation, and that reputation of a second-rate finikin kind. This factory, except for the curiosity of its old models of rococo figures, surely at best a trumpery application of the ceramic art, is simply nowhere. And yet these antiquated styles are the staple fund of inspiration of the numberless fancy china-makers all over the country, particularly in Saxony. They are copied to death, down to the vilest imitations. The old pieces of Dresden, as being unique, have an antiquarian bric-à-brac value in the eyes of collectors; but if nowadays an elaborate dinner service for five thousand dollars, or an expensive presentation ornament is wanted in the world's market, it is usually ordered of an English or of a

¹It must, however, be admitted that this want of practical ability, noticeable at home, does not appear among Germans abroad. They soon adopt English and American practical methods, and even excel in them, as also as inventors. Sir Henry Bessemer, inventor of steel rails, was, as said already, a born German, and, above all, Sir William Siemens and Werner Siemens should not be forgotten.

French factory. The French factory at Sèvres even to-day produces works of ceramic art that are far beyond anything Germany has ever produced. That the productions of Sèvres in the past were artistically incomparably superior to anything Germany ever attempted, is too well known to require substantiation.¹

The potteries of Silesia and Bavaria find a large home market for their goods—thanks to protection—although they are mostly clumsy in pattern and coarse in material—in fact, very inferior to the Austrian article of the same class. But a large amount of the better class of pottery used in Germany is made in Luxemburg, in Sarreguemines, as well as imported from France.

It is interesting to note that in this special branch of manufacture, in which the Germans had the start of all others, and in which they have long been renowned for cheapness, they have not to any appreciable extent yet succeeded in point of excellence—a fact sufficiently proved by their inability to supply the best foreign market with articles for use or for ornament to any appreciable extent. They do a large business in pottery with America and England and the colonies, but almost entirely in medium and inferior goods.

We can trace distinctly the benefit the Germans derive from their excellent trained designers to be confined to those industries where artistic conventional ornamentation alone is required. From the moment the article wanted is one in which the designer is

¹ Since this was first written the Royal China factory in Berlin has made enormous strides, as was seen and fully recognized at the Columbian Exposition at Chicago.

required to adapt his artistic knowledge to the production of some original, practical design, he generally fails. In this respect, the national art industry schools have hitherto helped him but little. This want of practical ability is, perhaps, one of the reasons why the German instinctively turns abroad for practical models as well as for ideas, and is forced to import a quantity of articles he is unable to produce.

The want of practical ability in the nation is abundantly proved by the almost medieval character of their beds, with those dreadful feather counterpanes (*plu-meaux*), and also by their strange disregard of the laws of health in the lack of ventilation in their houses, though in this respect great improvements are to be seen. Although we hear so much about the cutlery of Solingen and their barefaced imitations of English goods, it is a fact that a large proportion of German carpenters, locksmiths, cabinet-makers, etc., until quite recently used English-made tools.

V

We must now take note of some instances in which German talent for "adaptation" leads to downright piracy, and even fraudulent imitation. Not that we intend to reproach the Germans as a nation with the dishonesty of sections of their traders, or think them less scrupulous than others. The fact is, our laws were hitherto too lax, and the Germans too quick to avail themselves of their laxity. We should do the same if the conditions allowed of our doing so with success. We know too well that a certain percentage

of humanity of every land and clime is equally ready to turn an "honest" penny by doubtful means. And when we are able to turn German ideas to account without paying for them, we do it as readily as they; witness our piracies of German theater pieces, and of other property of an intellectual or artistic kind. Still, it is the duty of our laws to check where we cannot change the sordid side of human nature; and bearing this in mind, it is not without reason that we state the opinion that the German talent for adaptation, for producing colorable imitation, and their great want of originality in commerce, place their manufacturers in stronger temptation than our own to seek their designs, their models, and patterns in other countries, and thus occasionally to trade on the ideas of others to a degree that is as astounding as it is stoutly denied in the Fatherland.

Not only this, but the loose construction of the German laws for the protection of trade-marks and designs (*Musterschutz*) is very often productive of injustice among themselves as well as to the foreigner, which can never have been contemplated by the high-minded men who framed them. If their registration system does not work wonders in protecting their own mental property among themselves, it is not surprising that it affords little protection when the mental property pilfered hails from beyond the sea.

If we look closer at German manufacturers, we find that they fail uniformly to reach the highest standard to be met with in other leading countries. The large importation of their goods has had a deteriorating effect on the public taste, though it has, in many

instances, put our own makers on their mettle. They have made the public and the producer consider cheapness before everything else.

Besides copying the English, they honor other nations with equal attention. Whatever is brought out in Vienna in the special trades the Viennese excel in—fancy bronzes and leather goods—is immediately copied in Offenbach and elsewhere. American sewing-machines are kept out by German imitations. The so-called "articles de Paris" of the past almost all come from Berlin now, even including an enormous trade in ready-made costumes.

It seems strange, indeed, that in a country whose officials are such models of high-minded rectitude and duty, whose thinkers and men of science stand so high, such slavish imitations in commerce should be so common. For it is mainly in certain fields of commerce which are closely allied to science, such as chemistry, electricity, and the manufacture of scientific instruments and artillery, that the Germans excel. In chemistry they have made some of the most remarkable inventions in our time. Their chemical factories also, and those of Austria, are legitimately outdoing us in this branch of commerce. In these instances doubtless the natural bent of the national mind for science and their unrivaled technical schools go for something, whereas, in so many other branches, they are little better than imitators of an inferior but earnestly painstaking kind. It is hard to have to say that the people who gave mankind the greatest discovery of the age—the spectroscope of Kirchhof and Bunsen—are the arch commercial pirates of our time.

Some years ago the Prussian government sent Professor Reuleaux as their commissary to report on some distant international exhibition. On his return he startled the Fatherland with the verdict that German goods were distinguished by being uniformly cheap and bad (*billig und schlecht*). This created a great stir at the time, and may have been a somewhat exaggerated verdict, but there was some truth in it; and matters have not materially changed since, although many patriots fondly pretend that they have. It is not that the Germans are alone in producing rubbish—every commercial nation does the same; but the Germans have a special faculty for copying the rubbish of other nations, besides producing their own.

VI

Besides imitating everything foreign, whether an idea or a mere pattern, the Germans trade on each other's ideas to an extent that is perhaps unequaled in the world. In fact, were it not for the restraining influence of their somewhat unpractical trade-mark laws, it would be even worse than it is. Some years ago a certain Dr. Jaeger traveled about the country holding lectures to popularize his system of woollen clothing, and recommending patterns of his own design made by a certain Stuttgart maker. His propaganda created a great demand for the article, which was at once copied by several rival makers, who adopted his designs and denominations.

Although not strictly commercial, the following is apropos. Some years ago a delightful sketch of Ber-

lin middle-class town life, "The Buchholz Family," by Julius Stinde, achieved great popularity and ran through many editions. It will scarcely be believed that the very title was pirated by a compatriot, and a book was offered to the public under the title of the "Buchholz Family in Paris"!

We have already referred to the Offenbach imitations of English and Viennese leather goods patterns; for the Viennese are far ahead of the Germans in fancy leather goods,¹ as they are also in artistic bronzes. But it does not stop here; the Berlin leather-workers copy the Offenbachers, and undersell them in the cheaper German home market. The manufacturers of Offenbach evidently think there is nothing like leather, for some of their leather goods are among the few German articles that seem fairly able to compete with English-made ones, and the trade between Offenbach, England, and America is very large indeed. The process of copying and underselling each other is observable in almost every German trade, and produces a keenness of competition often of a kind that is far from elevating.

No wonder the Germans are continually complaining of over-production. But, as the only thing that is eternal is change, so the Germans may well look forward with hope to the future as likely to bring them more independence of ideas in commerce, as our time has already brought them national independence. The consciousness of the latter must, sooner or later, react on their manufacturing industry. A nation that

¹ The above, although strictly true, may need some qualifications, inasmuch as the South Germans are lately producing goods in embossed leather which need fear no comparisons.

for generations had been accustomed to look abroad for many things besides manufactured articles cannot create in a moment an original supply for all its wants.

In the meantime, it must be a source of gratification to all well-wishers of the Fatherland that the splendid penal laws against adulteration of food have preserved this one vital branch of human production in Germany from the scandalous manipulations we constantly witness in England and America.

In the foregoing we have endeavored to draw an impartial pro and con picture of the growth of commerce and industry in Germany of recent years. The facts and figures which are brought forward can necessarily give but a very limited and only temporarily applicable idea of so vast a matter. There remains a broader and wider deduction to be made as the sum of the subject. In their commerce and industry the Germans have already succeeded in transforming theory into method and practice on a gigantic scale. To judge by what they have already done, the time cannot be very far distant when German goods will not only be generally recognized in consequence of their cheapness and adaptability to the market, but also, as in the Middle Ages, by their honest excellence as well.

SUMMARY

During the past fifteen years the manufacture and consumption of German goods has increased enormously. Conditions of trade have changed; the spirit of enterprise so long confined to England has spread. Cheapness of labor is one cause of this remarkable

•

change; others are adaptability of the Germans in applying their knowledge to the changing demands of the market, and their extraordinary concentration and earnestness of purpose. Paternal government, too, gives its aid to commerce. German clerks surpass those of all other nations in their thrift, hard-plodding commercial training, and their knowledge of foreign languages. Moreover, Germany has an advantage over England with its trade unions, bound by their conservatism, lack of thrift, and meaner social position. The French, too, are conservative, rarely going beyond their own borders for models, and propagating most patriotically their own specialties of manufacture. The impetus to greater production, with the consequent demand for models, has revealed little originality among the Germans, as, for example, in their chinaware; while in many departments of trade the nation has shown a lack of practical ability. In some cases the talent for adaptation has led to downright piracy, and their own loose laws for the protection of trade-marks and designs often lead to injustice among themselves as well as toward foreigners. But conditions are improving, and German goods are now becoming known not alone for their cheapness and adaptability, but more and more for their excellence.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. How is German adaptability shown in the development of their commerce?
2. How does the government promote commercial enterprises?
3. What is the nature of German commercial education?

4. What may be said of their lack of originality in production?
5. Illustrate their lack of taste in the case of china manufacture.
6. To what extent are German manufacturers imitators?
7. In what domain is German inventive power most marked?
8. What may be said in general of German commercial progress?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Germany, Present and Past. S. Baring-Gould

CHAPTER XIII

THE GERMAN PRESS

Er lügt wie gedruckt.¹—*Popular Saying.*

I

Junius was of the opinion that Englishmen should sooner give up their Parliament, the responsibility of their ministers, the Habeas Corpus Act, even the right of taxing themselves, than surrender the freedom of the press; for that alone would bring back all these boons.

Many Anglo-Saxons would be prepared to subscribe to that even now, but few Germans. They fear the power of journalism, but, as a rule, do not respect it. Not that the German press is one whit less honorable and self-respecting than the English, but the German temperament does not look upon "print" with the same awe that Englishmen do. As shown by the popular saying, "He lies like print," the critical German mind instinctively feels with Bismarck, when he said in the Reichstag, February 6, 1888:

As far as the press is concerned, I cannot attach any decisive weight to it. They say in Russia it means more than in France. I am of the opposite opinion; in France the press is a power that influences the decisions of the government; in

¹ He lies like print.

Russia it is not the case, nor can it be; but in both cases the press is, in my eyes, only printing ink on paper, against which we do not war. For us there can lie no challenge in such materials. Behind every article in the press there is but one individual, who handles the pen in order to publish this article to the world; the same in a Russian paper—let us assume it is an independent Russian paper that is in connection with French secret funds, that is perfectly immaterial. The pen that indites therein an anti-German article has nobody at its back but he who holds it in his hand, the single individual, who produces this lucubration in his study, and the protector that a Russian paper usually possesses, some high official who has got entangled in party politics, and who perhaps happens to grant this paper his protection, both weigh but as a feather against the authority of his majesty the emperor of Russia.

The above sentiments, not only Bismarck but Germans in general apply to the press of every country more or less, and hence the German press never had, and never will have, the power the press wields in England. This leads us to believe that the Germans as a nation are much more mentally phlegmatic than Englishmen. Although perhaps more nervously irritable and excitable in some ways, their judgment is more sober and placid; they think more for themselves than Englishmen do.

A German will read a violent newspaper article, and, instead of being carried away by it, like one of ourselves, will say to himself: "This is written by that virulent rascal X; what can be the matter with him to-day?" On the other hand, he will casually read a journalistic opinion at variance with his own from mere intellectual curiosity, where an Englishman will studiously avoid reading any paper but the one holding his own views, and will generally blindly adopt the

views of his favorite paper, even if they happen to differ from his own. The German reader retains his independence of judgment far more, and will unhesitatingly stop taking a paper whose views no longer suit him.

The late Emperor William could never again be induced to look at the *Kreuzzeitung* after it had once taken a line that offended him, though this single act was strangely at variance with that great and good man's character, always so free from every personal feeling of resentment. The Berlin *National Zeitung*, for instance, in one day lost thousands of readers when it adopted a line of its own that did not agree with their views. The journalistic tactics so common in England, of advocating what was previously opposed, are decried in Germany, and looked upon as proofs of want of principle. A newspaper that avowedly changes its views with, or in advance of, the current of public opinion, would wield little influence in Germany; its opinion would not command respect or weight. The journalistic ambition of shaping public opinion—admirably as it works in England—does not succeed there.

In their anxiety for "conscientious conviction" Germans are often exaggerated and unpractical, and become *Principienreiter*—i. e., men that ride about on a broom labeled "Überzeugungstreu" (fidelity of conviction!). The Liberal politician who before the battle of Sadowa had dared to hint at the possibility of Bismarck's being in the right, was morally a dead man. The same fate awaited him who some years ago dared to find fault with the notorious May Laws against the Roman Catholics which are condemned to-day by all parties.

Also, the Germans carry far more personal feeling into their political opinions than we do, and journalists of opposite ways of thinking are not always ready to give their opponents that credit for honesty of purpose Englishmen concede, except in reference to Irish affairs. In the latter they come very near to German virulence and invective, as to which the following is an example taken at random from the next papers at hand.

A polemic between the Democratic *Frankfort Gazette* and the *North German Gazette*, Bismarck's official organ at the time, yields the following amiable buds of rhetoric:

When some weeks ago the *North German Gazette* undertook to cast a vile aspersion on the *Frankfort Gazette*, and we in return accused that sheet of shameless lying, the voluntary government organ quietly pocketed the accusation. We were not surprised at this, as there is no accounting for tastes. Still we could hardly have expected that the *North German Gazette* would have the barefacedness to bring up that same lie again. (Extract *Frankfort Gazette*, July 24, 1888.)

Pretty severe this, but the *North German Gazette* had aggravated its original aspersion by coolly stating that the *Frankfort Gazette* was not a German paper at all. Now, as that influential journal is the property of a Jew, that was distinctly hitting below the belt, and calculated to exasperate the party receiving the blow! The *North German Gazette* seems to have had a rather lively time of it, for almost on the same day we find the ultra-Conservative *New Prussian Cross Gazette* declaring it to be "impertinently arrogant," "untruthful," and again "impertinent."

Yes, political partisanship in the press is very vio-

lent in Germany. The Prussian Conservative papers, in their blind hatred of everything Liberal, attack even those harmless and charitable convivialists, the Freemasons. The Liberal and Democratic press become figuratively black in the face at the mere reference to a Prussian feudalism; and, sad to say, many are the journalistic elements in the Fatherland who would often have welcomed a humiliation to Bismarck, even if it included an injury to the country. Thus party politics show no more amiable characteristics in Germany than elsewhere.

Bismarck's estimate of the press has been referred to, but in its manipulation he showed his usual skill. The master mind that used all parties, and in turn cast them in the shade, played sad havoc with German journalistic conscientious fads. He drove his opponents wild. He used his press organs either to coax or to threaten, to butter or to bully, to draw a red herring across their path, or to set up a scarecrow in their fields. It was all the same—it invariably answered the purpose he had in view.

Some years ago all Europe was kept in a state of anxiety by a general cry of the German government press that the Russians were massing troops on their eastern frontier. Since then all has long been silence on that subject, and although in all probability not a Cossack has since those days been withdrawn from the German frontiers, any paper venturing to hint at Russian troops would be roundly accused of either trickery or want of patriotism.

Now and then the public saw through it, and when the *North German Gazette* was unusually "rampa-

geous," and the *Cologne Gazette* joined in, it was generally understood that the tom-tom at the village fair was being beaten. Something is coming, and soon we shall be invited by the "strong man" at the booth to hurry up, pay our pennies, and see him throw his hundredweights in the air, swallow fire, and otherwise prove again and again that he is the strongest man alive, and the rest of humanity mere black beetles.

II

Thirty years ago the English press possessed nearly its present power, and that of France numbered some of her most brilliant writers as contributors. In those days the press of Germany was in a very backward condition, its news of antediluvian flavor, and its commercial enterprise at the minimum. The last twenty years have wrought a great change in this as in so many other matters. Although the press is hardly, as with us, the road to fame or fortune (except in very rare cases), although comparatively few men of known literary attainments contribute to it (except in the *feuilleton*¹ as essay-writers), to-day it is an energetic exponent of public opinion, its news is almost as varied as our own, and although without much political influence, it is carried on on broad commercial principles.

Germany does not, like England, possess one intellectual and political capital, but rather a number of such, and thus no one exposition of opinion could possibly command the influence or enjoy the circulation

¹ The part of a continental newspaper that is devoted to light literature, serial stories, or criticisms.

possessed by any of our great daily papers. The Berlin newspapers permeate the north of Germany, but Saxony clings with strong local feelings to those of Leipzig and Dresden. The Breslau papers are read in Silesia and Eastern Prussia, the *Cologne Gazette* circulates principally in the West, besides possessing, like the *Berliner Tageblatt* and the *Frankfort Gazette*, a large foreign circulation. The *Frankfort Gazette* is the most important paper in South Germany (with the *Cologne Gazette* it is perhaps the best edited paper in all Germany), which possesses but few other papers of note—the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of Munich and the *Neueste Münchner Nachrichten*. Nor must we forget the *Hamburger Nachrichten*, which as soon as Prince Bismarck was popularly supposed to contribute to its columns was read all over the Continent.

Thus it will be seen that there is no strong centrality in the press, as in England; for although one or two of the Berlin papers may be the most widely circulated, no single one of them has the political or literary standing of one or two provincial papers. Also certain of these, including the *Vienna Free Press*,¹ have a more diffused circulation all over the country than some of the Berlin papers, the two most popular of which are perhaps the *Berliner Tageblatt* and the *Lokal-anzeiger*, the latter boasting of as many as two hundred thousand subscribers.

Although no German newspaper can be mentioned for commercial enterprise beside English or American leading journals, yet there are a few that have out-

¹ Although in reality Austrian, this paper must be considered German in the same sense that many other things in Austria are German.

stripped all home competitors in this respect. Here may be mentioned as preëminent in this respect the *Berliner Tageblatt*, the *Berliner Lokalanzeiger*, the *Vossische Zeitung*, the *Frankfort Gazette*, the *Cologne Gazette*, and the *Vienna New Free Press*.

German newspapers are, unlike English, chiefly subscribed for and received regularly, and taken in this way cost about two cents daily. Some of them appear as often as three or four times a day, in morning, afternoon, and evening numbers, with various supplements. Bought singly, they are somewhat dearer. The system by which all German papers can be ordered, paid for, and delivered through the post-office works admirably. As the price of the newspapers does not exceed the cost of paper and printing, their principal income is derived from advertisements, and hence, too, they cannot afford to offend the interests that advertise, or take an independent line that might jeopardize their circulation, and are forced to adhere to the plain commercial principles that alone enable them to exist. To increase their circulation almost all German papers adopt the *feuilleton* with its anecdotal gossip, and many of them are forced to publish serial stories, as that gives them a greater chance of gaining subscribers than any other literary merit or loftiness of purpose or principle.

III

From a literary point of view, there is a great difference between German and English papers. In that peculiar form of editorial writing, that talent for

grouping of ideas which enables them to put a question superficially, but pithily and clearly, before the reader, so cleverly that he almost loses sight of the fact of its being written from a party standpoint (and thus without impartial logical value), the Germans do not come up to the English. Also, as graphic reporters of passing events, the field of the special correspondent, they cannot compare with English or American writers.

On the contrary, in the dispassionate, thorough *résumé* of a political or social question, as well as in criticism, particularly on art and science, they surpass the English. Passing over those sheets that seem principally to live on a continual round of political squabbling, there are some papers—notably, the Munich *Allgemeine Zeitung*—that not only reach a high standard of literary excellence,¹ but also combine a rare impartiality of opinion with serious breadth of treatment.

The *Allgemeine Zeitung* is one of the few German papers that has traditions. It was formerly published in Augsburg, and to its columns the poet Heine contributed his well-known Paris letters. For a long time it withstood the temptation of adding to its circulation by the introduction of the *feuilleton*. In fact, we cannot but consider the *Allgemeine Zeitung* an ornament and a credit to the journalism of the country. For solidity of information on the scientific topics it touches, it is unrivaled among daily papers, and reminds us in this of some of our best reviews without

¹ In this respect the Berlin *National Zeitung* also deserves to be mentioned; many of its articles are signed by the writers.

their party bias. It contains more solid intellectual information, as distinct from news, than any other paper we know of. Daily it brings exhaustive articles, sometimes in a series, on all sorts of topics of cosmopolitan interest, and the reader is sure to learn something on whatever subject it treats. In London it is only in the leading papers that we find now and then special articles, chiefly reviews, of a similar exhaustive character. The following headings of leading articles, taken at random day by day, will enable the reader to judge of the scope of its matter: "Prussia's Agricultural Administration in the Years 1884-87"; "The Inundations of Hwangho" (giving a graphic description of the inundations of this great Chinese river during the last thousand years, and its bearing on the civilization of the country); "The Constitution of Japan"; "King Louis I. of Bavaria, as the Educator of his People," etc. Many of these articles are signed, run through several numbers of the paper, and are written by well-known authorities on the subjects of which they treat. That a paper of the stamp of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* must be a popular educator as well as a means of keeping its readers conversant with the current news of the day goes without saying; and we can only express the wish that some capitalists could see their way to start a newspaper on similar lines in other countries.

The main typical distinction between English and German papers consists in the *feuilleton*—it includes the matter printed under the black line that runs horizontally across the middle of the paper. Although often devoted to sensational or other novels, per-

sonal anecdotes, notes on art and literature, it also includes serious criticisms of current art topics. Pictures, theaters, and above all music, are treated and criticised in the *feuilleton*; although the value of German criticism on painting is disputed by some, there can be no doubt of the invariable excellence of the average theatrical and musical articles. In fact, a regular perusal of them is almost a liberal education on these subjects. Also such names as Lübke, Schnase, Jordan, Frenzel, Avenarius, Pietsch, as *feuilleton* writers, speak well for the standard which is current in the German *feuilleton*.

IV

Let us take last a point of view of journalism that journalists are fond of presenting to us before all else—the moral aspect. With regard to the publication of indecent tales and anecdotes, the German press stands far purer than the French. A paper that would publish a serial story such as “La Terre” of Zola, which appeared first in the *Gil Blas* (and was even confiscated in Russia), would be seized immediately and excluded henceforth from every respectable German household.

In regard to the publication of obscene trials, the concise laws on the subject remove the most enterprising newspaper proprietors out of the reach of temptation. The public is excluded from such trials, and although the press is admitted, the law ordains that no press reports of such trials are allowed, except with the consent of the court, and after perusal of

such reports by the state advocate. There are some people left in Germany who think these officials are more likely to know what is good for public consumption than enterprising newspaper proprietors.

In theory, the powers possessed by the court are certainly liable to be arbitrarily used, for they go beyond the right of forbidding the publication of indecency, they apply to high treason and other matters; hence here the captious critic may well detect the cloven foot of paternal government. But the high character of the German bench has hitherto proved to be a sufficient guarantee against bias and undue influence; and, after all, the benefit of the community being safe from sewer filth and flooding is very great, and cannot easily be paid for too dearly. The idea of a discretionary limit of publicity endangering the liberty of the subject nowadays is one only fit for the nursery.

There are also here and there a few Germans left who think it a doubtful testimony to a country's institutions to have to admit that its vilest abuses can only hope to be remedied, and its filth to be cleansed away, by the indiscriminate action of the press pandering to the sensational cravings of a half-educated public. The German press has not yet, in its self-consciousness, come to regard itself as the Augean stable-cleansing Hercules of the community. The Germans look abroad, and do not feel impressed by the success of the press in that character in other countries. However dreamy and unpractical they may be in some matters, they have common sense enough to suspect an indignation, the source of which doubles the circu-

lation, for the time, of the righteous organ of public opinion.

The one moral blot on German journalism is the character of its advertisements; they are not always above suspicion, though flagrant cases of impropriety are rare. Still, in the advertisement columns of the German press the petty spirit of hatred, spite, and slander of the Philistine airs itself. Anonymous attacks on personal character are occasionally met with such as an English jury would deal with severely. But this occurs more in places outside the main stream of national life, in places where the press is intellectually poor, spiteful, and contemptible. There we find sheets that appeal to every local prejudice, alternately cringing and slandering, blatant with beery patriotism, while living on envious tittle-tattle and scandal. Wherever such sheets are found, it is interesting to note the want of healthy public life, the low state of morality of the population, and the underground spread of socialism among the working classes. Thus, if a sound press be not always an infallible mentor of public morals, a vicious newspaper is a certain indicator of popular corruption.

One tendency of the German press merits reprobation: the proclivity to comment on cases under judgment, in contrast with the English press, which, in this respect, is well restrained. This latter assertion as regards the self-restraint of the English press can, however, we fear, hardly be upheld in its entirety since recent events in South Africa. But while on important matters restriction is advisable, needless interference is certainly irritating and impolitic. It is

a question whether even Bismarck might not, in some instances, have magnanimously followed the example of Frederick the Great, who, when offensive pasquils were issued against him, would order the placards to be put lower down on the walls, that the people might read them the more easily.

We have referred to the strong personal and passionate character of the German press to-day, but we cannot conclude without a word of admiration for its tone during the War of 1870. It was worthy of a great nation. Its earnest tone, totally removed from bounce and bluster, in those days was as admirable as some of its excess of passion, when dealing with internal party politics to-day, is to be regretted. But even in dealing with our own time there is one more word to be said. Whatever the shortcomings of the German press may be, it is at all events *not yet venal*. What that means will be best understood when the historian of the last quarter of this century comes to handle the interesting subjects of Panama and South Africa.

SUMMARY

Unlike the Anglo-Saxons, most Germans fear the power of journalism, but do not respect it. The French press also wields a greater influence than does the German. Journalistic ambition to shape public sentiment is not so potent in Germany as in England, for the Germans show greater independence in forming their opinions. German editorials contain more personal feeling; political partisanship is bitter. Bismarck used the press to admirable advantage for

furthering his measures of public policy. During the past twenty years the German press has made greater advancement than that of any other nation. As Germany possesses no one intellectual capital, each section of the country has its own important journals, and no paper can exert the influence wielded by a great London daily. Most of the papers, as in other countries, are largely dependent for profit upon their advertisements. While the German press may be inferior to that of other nations in clever editorials and graphic reports of passing events, it excels in its excellent *résumés* of political and social questions, and in scholarly articles on scientific problems; the *feuilletons* also contain much valuable matter. The moral standard of journalism is far higher than that in France. Press censorship is more severe, and newspapers devote less space to sensational matter. Sometimes the advertising columns, especially in the smaller towns, show the petty Philistine spirit. But whatever the shortcomings of the German press, it is free from venality.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. How differently is the power of the press regarded in England and in Germany?
2. Illustrate the view that Germans are more independent in their thinking than the English.
3. Show how the personal element enters into German politics in a marked degree.
4. Illustrate Bismarck's control of the press.
5. How are the strong provincial interests of Germany shown by her newspapers?
6. How are the papers distributed?
7. How is a German paper made to pay?

8. In what respects are German papers inferior to those of England?
9. Give an illustration of their superiority.
10. What is the *feuilleton*?
11. What moral aspect has the German newspaper?
12. In what respects are the advertisements often of a low character?
13. What was the tone of the press during the War of 1870?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Germany, Present and Past. S. Baring-Gould.

CHAPTER XIV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

If circumstances lead me, I will find
Where truth is hid, though it were hid indeed
Within the center.

—*Shakespeare.*

I

We have striven to point to a few characteristics of Germany in the present day. In conclusion, we will endeavor to review our impressions and add to them. For we believe that, without being blind to its social, political, and other shortcomings, there is much in Germany to-day of the deepest interest to us.

Far be it from our thoughts that Germany is ever destined to distance the Anglo-Saxon race in the competition for the world's markets. The mass of the German people have hitherto not shown themselves to possess that peculiar aggressive vitality which has made the English race the pioneers of colonization all over the world. Though the Germans spare no pains in tapping trade, if hard work can do it, they have hitherto not been eager in risking human lives, and above all money, in order to secure remote ultimate commercial results. If this has to be done on any large scale, it will soon mark the limits of their trans-oceanic enterprise.¹ The present preponderant posi-

¹ The last ten years have revealed an unexpected fund of energy and individual enterprise on the part of Germany. It is in every case, even

tion of Germany is owing to her great men, to the organization they have effected, and to the excellent qualities of the race which have made that organization possible. Whether these qualities are likely to distance the Anglo-Saxon in the long run only time can tell.

II

We have found a nation on a high level of education, and of healthy material prosperity, and whose best sons are imbued with a rare ideality of aim and purpose. The people are animated by a sense of duty and an earnest devotion to work which are hardly to be surpassed in the world. In this sentiment every difference of creed and party is submerged, until it forms a paramount law of ethics of universal practical application. We see this particularly in the honesty of the administration of the country as well as in the high standard of rectitude and honor observable in all the educated—notably in the professional classes. It is the moral force underlying all this that is more instructive than any outward success, which is merely its result. We have found an absence of pauperism, of drunkenness, and other forms of degradation, as striking as they are pleasant to note.

The physical appearance of the male population when compared with that of Austria and France shows, particularly in the North, a healthy, sturdy manliness of bearing that is partly due to the beneficial hygienic effects of universal military service. Also the observer

to-day, much too soon to mark the limits of the "likely" or the "possible" as far as the future of German trade is concerned. Thus it is only fair to state that the above expression of opinion can only be accepted with reserve.

is met almost everywhere by outward evidences of progress and prosperity.

Berlin, which numbered only one hundred thousand inhabitants at the beginning of the century, and hardly half a million in 1870, possesses now a population of one million five hundred thousand. The Berlin University, only founded at the beginning of the century, to-day boasts the *élite* of intellectual Germany in its staff of professors, and attracts the greatest number of students of any German university—over four thousand. Whole suburbs have sprung into existence—to the west, consisting of beautiful private houses; elsewhere, factories and works have arisen, reëchoing the sound of the hammer and anvil and steam. The town that only yesterday was noted for its monotonous, lifeless streets, has now outstripped every town in Europe, except London, in the plenitude of its bustle and life. Public buildings, such as the head post-office, the new town hall, the different barracks, strike the eye by their vast dimensions, and the new Reichstag building when finished bids fair to become the grandest building of its kind in the world.

Nor does Berlin stand alone in the outward signs of increased prosperity. Towns such as Frankfort-on-the-Main, Munich, Magdeburg, Breslau, Stuttgart, Carlsruhe, Cologne, Dusseldorf, Dresden, Leipzig, and many others, have wonderfully improved in appearance, as also gained in material riches. Everywhere new streets of palatial buildings have risen, and there are now dozens of towns in Germany the shop windows of which could vie with any in England out-

side London. Hamburg, the Venice of the North, has become one of the finest towns of Europe. Over forty million dollars have been expended upon her harbor and warehouses; and her commercial activity can be gauged by the one fact that within the last few years she has outstripped London as a coffee mart. Hamburg has become one of the largest seaports in the world. The tonnage of her shipping already exceeds that of Liverpool. As for Strassburg, the German rule in ten years has done more than the French did in two hundred. The new university building alone well repays a visit.

Modern public buildings of every kind in Germany show a grandeur and solidity of monumental architecture rarely met with elsewhere. That the soldiers' barracks to be found in almost every large town are gigantic structures will surprise no one. In towns such as Berlin, Dresden, and Munich, they form almost separate quarters of their own. But it is the cleanliness and order that particularly strike the eye. The town halls, the post-offices particularly, and even the police stations and the prisons of even second-rate towns, are generally imposing edifices and models of order and cleanliness. Even the day-schools are large buildings, uniting excellent practical accommodation with chaste architectural style. The theaters of towns such as Dresden, Frankfort, Leipzig, Berlin, and many others, hardly need a word of encomium on the score of their elegance and solidity. Whether large or small, their construction and administration are such, that, whereas hundreds of lives have been lost by theater fires in England, France, Italy, Austria, and even in

America, during the last twenty years, no such misfortune has happened in Germany.

Those who look closer for indirect evidences of healthy national life cannot fail to be impressed with the excellent municipal organization that regulates town life. Everywhere unexceptional order and cleanliness have replaced the old sleepy conditions of the past. Part of this is undoubtedly due to the very superior class of men from whom are chosen the mayors and town councilors of the larger German cities. Men of the stamp of Von Forckenbeck, late mayor of Berlin, Dr. Miguel, some years ago mayor of Frankfort-on-the-Main, to-day Prussian minister of finance, have undoubtedly done much to raise the character of municipal administration in Germany.¹

The splendid bridges over the Rhine and other rivers are notable instances of excellence of design combined with solidity of work. The railway stations, even of towns such as Hanover, Magdeburg, and Strassburg, are beyond anything we have to show outside London; while Berlin, Munich, and Frankfort-on-the-Main, and latterly Cologne, each possesses a station on a larger scale than our largest—the Midland, at St. Pancras. The Frankfort station—the largest in the world—covers an area of 33,852 square yards, and is, we believe, a third larger than St. Pancras. It cost over seven million five hundred thousand dollars, half of which was contributed by the state and the other half by the town. The new railway stations at Dresden on both sides of the river Elbe will, when com-

¹ As an instance of the healthiness of municipal government in Germany, it may be mentioned, that the Berlin municipality closed the financial year of 1887 with a surplus of \$955,000.

pleted, be unique. With their approaches and other work connected with their construction they are expected to cost the enormous sum of sixteen million five hundred thousand dollars. This is poor military, tax-ridden, groaning Germany.

Everywhere, over hill and dale, are to be found fresh evidences of the vital energy pulsating through every artery of the country. Even country roads are uniformly kept in such order as contrasts strongly with the fate of some of our splendid old highways since the introduction of steam. In fact, to the naked eye, as far as the observer is able to judge of a nation's material condition by the outward evidence of her prosperity, Germany is materially far and away the most prosperous country in Europe.

III

Turning from these outward tangible evidences of national life, we find, on closer examination, that the population itself is far better off than we were accustomed to believe. If the happiness of a people be judged by its savings, the German masses seem to stand almost as well as the English of their own class. According to statistics, there are five hundred and twenty-five million dollars in German savings banks, whereas in English savings banks there are only four hundred millions. And this does not include the numerous small investors in German government stock, a class (until lately, through the Post-Office Savings Bank) practically non-existent in England.

According to another series of statistics, the wealth

of England is calculated as representing \$1,245 to each inhabitant, whereas every German is credited with only seven hundred dollars. Now if it be borne in mind that the enormous fortunes of England are practically unknown in Germany, that, in fact, incomes even of five thousand dollars a year are comparatively rare there, the above-quoted average must show a high standard of income for the masses of the population.

With regard to the indebtedness of the state, the following authentic tabulation of figures is also very suggestive:

Up to the year 1875 the new German Empire found itself in the most enviable position of being entirely free from debt. In that same year, however, the empire borrowed the modest sum of \$2,425,000, but it did not really spend this amount until three years later. From 1875 down to the present year the empire has contracted loans every year without exception, so that on April 1, 1895, twenty years after the first loan was effected, the imperial debt had attained the respectable total of \$507,128,125. The sum received amounted to \$31,339,135 less than the nominal figure. Of the present debt \$109,125,000 are at four per cent, \$189,271,250 at three and one-half per cent, and \$206,246,250 at three per cent. In the current financial year, 1896-97, the German government has borrowed rather less than \$10,790,000, being the smallest loan it has contracted since 1875. In the financial year 1888-89 it borrowed \$95,726,875; in 1890-91, \$74,265,625; in 1887-88, \$53,835,000; in 1893-94, \$48,500,000; in 1892-93, \$35,708,125; and in 1894-95, \$29,172,750. Of the total amount received by way of loans, \$304,216,250 have been spent on the army, \$67,596,875 on the navy, \$63,535,000 on railways and military defenses connected therewith, and \$15,216,875 on postal and telegraphic service. The Baltic Canal has cost the empire \$25,523,125, while \$12,610,000 have been expended on bringing the free ports of Bremen and Ham-

burg into the Imperial Customs Union. It is pointed out that though the German Empire has thus within twenty years run up a national debt of nearly \$525,000,000, nevertheless it possesses valuable assets as the result of this expenditure. The lands and buildings which it has acquired through the loans for the army are estimated to be worth \$218,250,000. The railways (and property relating thereto) which it has secured are valued at \$169,750,000, and the postal and telegraphic offices at \$72,750,000. Apart from this, however, the imperial government possesses a war treasure in hard cash amounting to \$29,100,000, besides various other items, including unspent balances and credits amounting to more than double the value of the war treasure.

Aristotle said, long ago, that the salvation of a country in a crisis must lie in its middle classes: in their increase lies its hope of permanence and prosperity. The tendency in England is to increase property in the hands of a few individuals, leaving an impoverished middle class, and cutting off the hope of the poorer classes ever rising into the middle class. The problem of the moment is to prevent this accumulation of immense fortunes in few hands and to spread the wealth throughout the country. This problem the Germans seem to be in the way of solving more satisfactorily than the English.

How comes it then, will be asked, if so many things are satisfactory in Germany, that a party such as the Social Democrats, bent on the subversion of everything existing, has so many followers that it has been able to send over forty of its representatives to the Reichstag? How comes it that Germany has had to use such repressive measures against the socialists that towns such as Berlin, Leipzig, Hamburg, Stettin, Frankfort, Offenbach, etc., have been proclaimed in

a continued modified state of siege in order to enable the authorities to cope with them?¹

The main reasons why it has become so seem to us to be the following: First, because of the high and yet politically most defective education of the masses; second, because the introduction of universal suffrage has enabled them to make their opinions felt. (This measure was considered a grave precipitancy on the part of Bismarck; but neither he nor anybody else could have foreseen that within ten years of attaining national unity, a million of voters would pin their faith to a party to which the idea of national existence even seems a secondary consideration.) Third, because of the very character of the masses themselves, who are less influenced by military splendor, in some senses more sober and less enthusiastically patriotic than elsewhere. Hence their care for the supremacy of their class interests is less interfered with by other considerations. This is distinctly proved by the great strides the movement has made amidst victory and commercial success. Part of the spread of socialism must also be put down more to the gospel of hate than to that of hope; for, although some of the socialist leaders are men of undoubted high principle and purity of motive, yet much of the envy and *Schadenfreude*—malicious joy—peculiar to Philistinism have gone to swell the number of their adherents. Englishmen talk of class hatred; but it is in Germany that true class hatred exists.

In England the trades unions, which had their

¹ This is no longer the case since the retirement of Prince Bismarck—but the suggestiveness of such a recent state of things remains.

origin in the unspeakable social misery of the working classes, have acted as valves, carrying off superfluous steam. Such have been to a great extent prevented in Germany, and as life is of a less depressing character to the workingman, secret combinations of this kind have been less resorted to. Socialism has more of an abstract or philosophic basis than the narrower aims of English trades unions. As a high Prussian legal authority expressed it, we educate the masses to look upon the will of the majority as law. What can we say, when the time comes for them to turn round, and, using our own arguments, to aver that being in a majority their will is law? This is the problem the statesmen of the future will have to face. Not the dearth or plenty of wages will influence its course. We find the Knights of Labor in America, where wages are high and employment plentiful. It is part and parcel of the increased fierceness of the struggle for existence of our time.

Whereas in Austria active brains have still an easy victory over laziness and stupidity, in Germany—particularly in the North—intelligence is already grappling with intelligence in the fierce struggle for existence, and breeds socialism in all the great centers of commerce and manufacture. As it fell to the French in a past century to deal with feudal aristocracy, so it will probably fall to the lot of Germany in a later century first to grapple with the problem of socialism. Not because the conditions of its laboring classes are the most onerous—far from it; but for the reasons given above, which place them in the front rank in clamoring for recognition.

The late Emperor William, in his message of February, 1881, to the working classes, recognized their right to be considered by the state, and the subsequent laws in favor of insurance in case of sickness, in case of accident, and, lastly, for provision for old age, have since emphasized his words. How far these measures will answer, the future alone can show. Those who prophesy a black future for the country from socialism may be right, but they would be strangely short-sighted if they surmised that these social problems will have to be solved only in Germany. They will come to the fore in all other countries,¹ and it is very questionable whether they will find other countries in the long run more prepared to meet the shock. For in Germany there exists a counterweight in the fact that the land is largely in possession of the people, which will tell its tale in favor of compromise; whereas those countries will feel the inevitable upheaval of the masses most in which the people are most dissatisfied with the social and economical conditions of their existence.

IV

The short reign of Frederick III. and its sequels have thrown a lurid light on the bitter party divisions of the country. Of the socialists we have spoken, though they are little understood in England. You must have lived in Germany to understand. The ultra-Liberals are only in a degree less opposed to every measure on which authority rests in Prussia. The Roman Catholics have proved that they recognize an

¹ The events of the last ten years have tended to confirm this view.

allegiance beyond the Alps, above the loyalty to the sovereign—yes, even perhaps above national interests. The Conservatives, although possessing many lofty characters in their ranks, are as a party too selfish, narrow-minded, and slow ever to be able to wield decisive parliamentary influence. The intellectual backbone of the country is perhaps to be found in what until recently was the National-Liberal party, though, in its turn, it is anything but a homogeneous body to-day, and is sadly diminished in members. Doctrinarism is the plague-spot of the National-Liberal and Liberal parties. The conscientious politician-professor is the bugbear of German politics, and his enthusiastic admiration of English institutions not the least suspicious element of his creed. It is invariably derived from book-knowledge, or from a very short stay in England. Nor must we omit the old "Particularistic" element—the term which signifies the feeling of loyalty the German possesses for his particular petty sovereign. This sentiment has grown in intensity—more particularly in Bavaria—since the retirement of Prince Bismarck, and with it a certain ill-concealed antagonism toward the spirit of northern Prussia.

These irreconcilable parties and currents of feeling and the very character of the German people, of which they are typical, do not hold out a guarantee that parliamentarianism, particularly that of a single, all-powerful chamber, is suited to the character or requirements of the nation.¹ On the contrary, it is the seed-ground of peril for the future. In its bosom are

¹ After Prince Bismarck's retirement the attendance of the members of the Reichstag dropped off to such an extent that the caterer in the building found his occupation gone—he could not make it pay.

the future allies of the socialists—the Catholics. The danger that lies in a possible social propaganda of the Catholics can be surmised when we look at Ireland. It is a democratic, almost socialistic, movement.

The Catholic Congress at Freiburg in September, 1888, distinctly pointed in the direction of Catholic participation in projects of social reform—the care for the masses. It is only necessary to bear in mind the power of the Catholic party in the country and in the Reichstag to feel that, once it joins hands with the Democratic faction, it will be a hot time for the moderate Liberals representing the resisting bulk of the middle classes. On these lines there is undoubtedly a powerful opening for the Catholic party.¹ For, if it is strong in itself, it is even stronger by the hopeless divisions of its political opponents. A party that presents a united parliamentary phalanx, literally, in the words of Lord Tennyson, stands

Four square to every wind that blows—

even when the object of its policy is almost anti-national; it may well bid its enemies beware, if once its policy should be such as to attract the sympathies of large classes of the population.

The many endeavors to lessen the services of Prince Bismarck by seeking to increase the credit of others has, like previous attempts, signally failed. Surely his reputation has no need of borrowed plumes. But public opinion has always wanted to know exactly whence everything originated. It can never be

¹ This was written first in 1887; to-day the Catholic party is the most powerful in the Reichstag.

believed that the late Emperor Frederick wished the world should know, by his diary, that he had been far more in the work of unity than had hitherto been acknowledged. This would be in too striking contrast with the conduct of his great father.

People are asking themselves what will become of the country and these elements of discord now that Bismarck has passed away. Why did he train no successors? But surely neither Pitt, Canning, nor Wellington left any successors either. The state is like a ship that has been guided through shoals; Bismarck at least left it with a model working system. If he somewhat lavishly used up the administrative capacity of the country, in one particular the working material of the nation stands untarnished, supreme—the army. Amidst all the bitterness of political discussion, its chief, Field-Marshal von Moltke, recently passed like a classic shadow of antiquity from the scene, after himself appointing his successor. Thus all those who are intent on retaining the means of developing everything that is to be valued in a nation must group themselves around the army. The time may come when all this may be sufficiently safeguarded by the free expression of public opinion, but it is not yet. In the meantime, the temper of the nation makes it very unlikely that it will embark in Quixotic adventures, such as the French, by their constitutional, periodical bloody outbreaks, have indulged in and suffered from.

Perhaps the most useful lesson the study of Germany teaches us to-day is, that *laissez-faire* as a system of social and political advancement—between an aristoc-

racy of the past and a democracy of the future playing at cross-purposes—is no longer the only shibboleth to swear by. A few additional watchwords can hardly fail to be suggested by an impartial study of Germany of to-day.

SUMMARY

Germany has not shown the aggressive vitality exhibited by the English; her excellence to-day is largely due to the worth of her great men and what they have accomplished. Back of German ideality a strong sense of duty manifests itself in the efficient administration of all departments of government. Along with remarkable increase in population and business, the large German cities show notable improvement in municipal administration. Public buildings exhibit a striking beauty of architecture and excellence of structure. The prosperity of the nation is evident, also, from its savings banks accounts, which compare favorably with those in England. While the government has borrowed largely during the last few years, it has spent much of these loans on permanent improvements.

Of the political parties, the Social Democrats are strong because of the deficient political education which exists throughout the country, the national lack of enthusiastic patriotism, and in part to the "materialistic joy" characteristic of the Philistine. The masses are beginning to feel their power. The Conservatives are, as a rule, selfish, narrow-minded, and lack the force necessary for a good administrative party. The National-Liberal party, in spite of its doctrinarism and "Particularistic" element, includes more than an

other the best intellectual life of the country. The Catholic party, recognizing a higher allegiance than that to the emperor, is steadily growing in power; its tendency to-day is toward the Democrats, and it has aggressively advocated social reforms.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. What superior qualities have been noted in this study of the German people?
2. What remarkable progress has Berlin shown since 1870?
3. What signs of prosperity can be noted in other German cities?
4. What is the general character of the public buildings, theaters, etc.?
5. How is prosperity indicated by municipal conditions, bridges, railway stations, etc.?
6. How does the average of wealth per capita compare with that of England?
7. What do figures show as to the state's indebtedness?
8. Why under these conditions have the Social Democrats become so strong?
9. What are the most influential parties in German politics to-day?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Germany, Present and Past. S. Baring-Gould.



INDEX.

- Adelmann, Count Alfred, 221.
 Albert, King of Saxony, 111.
 Alexander, Prince of Battenburg, 184.
 Alsace, 35, 45, 46, 125.
 Alsatians, 38, 122.
 Aristocracy, the, 32, 98, 108, Chap. VIII., 252, 253.
 Army, the, Chap. VII., 127, 329.
 Arndt, Ernst Moritz, 195.
 Arnim, Count, 163, 214.
 Bach, 75.
 Baden, Grand Duke of, 110.
 Barbarossa, 32, 33.
 Bazaine, Marshal, 177.
 Beer-houses, 234, 258.
 Beethoven, 72.
 Berlin, 133, 240, 318.
 Berlin Congress, 153, 167.
 Berlin, treaty of, 198.
 Berlin, University of, 318.
 Bessemer, Sir Henry, 285.
 Beust, Count, 163.
 Bill of Indemnity, 151.
 Billroth, Dr., 53, 63.
Birkenhead, the, 178.
 Bismarck, Chap. VI., 160.
 Bismarck, Herbert, 166, 193.
 Bismarck, Princess, 260.
 Bismarck, William, 166, 193.
 Bittenfeld, General von, 183.
 Blücher, 66, 188.
 Blumenthal, Oscar, 60.
 Bodenstedt, Friedrich, 56, 59.
 Börne, Ludwig, 28, 58.
 Boulanger, General, 44, 184, 197.
 Bucher, Lothar, 84.
 Budritzki, General von, 183.
 Bundesrath, 132.
 Bunsen, 51, 53.
 Carnot, General, 178.
 Carrière, Moritz, 54.
 Catherine, Empress, of Russia, 248.
 Catholic Congress, 328.
 Cavour, 35, 121.
 Charles V. of Hapsburg, 33.
 Charles Theodore, Duke, 211.
 Chopin, 73.
 Clive, Lord, 150, 159.
 Commerce, 130; and manufacture, Chap. XII.
 Conservatives, 304, 327.
 Cornelius, Peter, 76.
 Crimean War, 127, 147.
 Czermak, Professor, 53.
 Darwin, 51, 62.
 D'Hérissou, Count, 164, 177.
 Duelling, 88, 236.
 Dürer, Albrecht, 76, 289.
 Ebers, Georg, 59.
 Education, Chap. III., 97, 130, 259.
 Engel, Dr. Ernst, 53.
 Ense, Varnhagen von, 240.
 Esmarch, Professor von, 53, 211.
Feuilleton, the, 305, 307, 308, 310.
 Fitger, Arthur, 60.
 Forckenbeck, 320.
 Franco-German War, 193.
 Frankfort, 126, 238.
 Frankfort Parliament, 36.
 Frederick I., 92.
 Frederick II., 32, 107.
 Frederick III., 101, 105, 106, 109, 221, 326, 329.
 Frederick Charles, Prince, 177.
 Frederick, Empress, 233.
 Frederick the Great, 28, 31, 92, 93, 94, 97, 139, 170, 241, 313.

- Frederick William I., 93, 96, 108.
 Frederick William III., 65, 98, 248.
 Frederick William IV., 99, 103.
 French Revolution, 38, 122.
 Freytag, Gustav, 58, 212.
 Geffcken, Professor, 163.
 Gildemeister, Otto, 57.
 Gneisenau, General, 66.
 Gneist, Professor, 53.
 Goethe, 31, 55, 56, 66, 69, 100, 162, 249, 250, 265.
 Görne, Captain von, 177.
 Government, Chap. V.
 Gravelotte, battle of, 187.
 Grimm, Jakob and Wilhelm, 66.
 Gutzkow, Karl, 70.
 Haeckel, Ernst, 51, 84.
 Hamburg, 319.
 Handel, 75.
 Hardenberg, 99.
 Hartmann, Eduard von, 54, 84.
 Hartwig, 84.
 Hegel, 57, 61.
 Heidelberg, University of, 85.
 Heine, Heinrich, 58, 257, 308.
 Helmholtz, Herman von, 53, 241.
 Herder, 55.
 Herrenhaus, 27.
 Heyse, Paul, 58.
 Hochberg, Count, 242.
 Hohenzollern, House of, 38, Chap. IV.
 Holbein, 76.
 Holtzendorf, Dr. von, 53.
 Humboldt, Friedrich and Karl, 66.
 Ignatieff, General, 45.
 Iron Cross, the, 186.
 Isenberg, Count, 146.
 Jaeger, Dr., 295.
 Jena, battle of, 29.
 John of Saxony, 56.
 Jordan, William, 84.
 Kanitz, Count, 183.
 Kant, Immanuel, 62, 67, 82.
 Kaulbach, Wilhelm von, 76.
 Kirchhoff, 51, 53, 295.
 Knesebeck, Von der, 37.
 Koch, Dr. Robert, 53.
 Kuhn, General von, 199.
 Lagarde, Paul de, 54.
 Lang, Herr von, 248.
 Langenbeck, 53.
 L'Anjonne, 60.
 Laspeyres, 53.
 Lassalle, 240.
 Le Bourget, battle of, 182.
 Le Père Didon, 80, 235.
 Lenbach, Franz von, 76.
 Leopold, Emperor, 92.
 Lessing, 31, 55.
 Levin, Rahel, 240.
 Liberals, the, 106, 123, 268, 304, 326, 327.
 Lindau, Paul, 57.
 Liszt, 72.
 Literature, 55, 249, 307.
 Lorraine, 35, 45.
 Louis Ferdinand, 211.
 Louisa, Queen, 99, 248.
 Lubbliner, Hugo, 60.
 Ludermann, Hermann, 61.
 Luther, 66, 121, 169, 195.
 Maria Theresa, 248.
 Maybach, Dr. von, 137.
 May Laws, 302.
 Meissen, 290.
 Melancthon, 66.
 Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, 73.
 Mendelssohns, the, 240, 241.
 Menzel, Adolf, 76.
 Metternich, 100, 123, 188.
 Meyer, Hermann J., 84.
 Miguel, Dr., 320.
 Mischke, General, 221.
 Moltke, Count von, 66, 111, 152, 183, 184, 193, 200, 225.
 Mommsen, Dr. Theodor, 53.
 Moser, Gustav von, 61.
 Mozart, 72.
 Music, 70, 71, 72, 73.
 Nantes, Edict of, 96.
 Napoleon I., 28, 34, 35, 37, 44, 46, 157, 158, 195, 248.
 Napoleon III., 275.

- National-Liberal party, 327.
 National Union, 147.
 Nietzsche, Frederick, 54.
 Nordau, Dr. Max, 50.
 North German Confederation, 151.
 Nussbaum, 53.
 Oppolzer, 84.
 Philistine, the, 45, 72, 214, 215, Chap. XI., 263.
 Pless, Prince, 242.
 "Pour le Mérite," 58, 153.
 Presber, Hermann, 71.
 Press, the German, 165, Chap. XIII.
 Protection, policy of, 138, 161, 278.
 Puckler, Prince, 240.
 Puttkamer, Herr von, 107.
 Railway system, the, 136.
 Ranke, Leopold von, 53.
 Rapp, General, 34.
 Ratibor, Duke of, 241.
 Reichstag, 131.
 Reformation, the, 34, 121.
 Reuleaux, Professor, 85, 295.
 Revolution of 1848, 36.
 Richelieu, 42.
 Richthofen, G. von, 54.
 Rochow, Herr von, 144.
 Röntgen, Wilhelm C., 53.
 Roon, Count von, 66.
 Rosenbusch, Professor, 53.
 Rossini, 77.
 Sadowa, battle of, 42, 103, 149, 177.
 Scanzoni, 53.
 Schaffgotsch, Count, 97.
 Scharnhorst, 37, 66, 99.
 Schelling, 57, 61.
 Scherr, Johannes, 58.
 Schiller, 55, 56, 66, 162, 249, 255, 265.
 Schlegel, August and Friedrich, 56, 66.
 Schleinitz, 241.
 Schleswig-Holstein, 103, 125, 149.
 Schlieffen, Count, 184.
 Schönthan, Franz von, 60.
 Schopenhauer, 31, 58, 236.
 Schubert, 72.
 Schumann, 73, 75.
 Science, 51, 52, 294.
 Sedan, battle of, 42, 111, 187.
 Seven Days' War, 36.
 Seven Years' War, 35, 139.
 Social democracy, 140, 268.
 Social Democrats, the, 85, 120, 160, 268, 323.
 Socialists, 134, 323, 324, 325, 326.
 Society, German, Chap. IX.
 Spielhagen, 58.
 Staël, Madame de, 247.
 State indebtedness, 322.
 Stein, Baron von, 37, 66, 99, 188, 216.
 Steinmetz, General, 181.
 Stephan, Dr., 241.
 Strassburg, 319.
 Strauss, David, 58.
 Strudelwitz, Lieutenant von, 242.
 Talleyrand, 249.
 Thiers, 47.
 Thirty Years' War, 34, 35, 42, 91, 96, 103.
 Thun, Count, 145.
 Tieck, 56.
 Treitschke, Heinrich von, 57, 102, 188.
 Turco-Russian War, 153.
 Universities, the, 36, 79.
 Verdi, 72.
 Versailles, coronation at, 42, 104.
 Virchow, Professor, 53.
 Voss, Richard, 56, 60.
 Wagner, Richard, 74, 109.
 Waldersee, Count, 183, 184.
 War of 1866, 104, 111, 151.
 War of 1870, 35, 46, 111, 129, 152, 185, 187, 189, 199, 200, 225, 313.
 Weber, 72.
 Weber, Karl Julius, 143.
 Wildenbruch, Ernst von, 60.
 William I., 102.
 William II., 109, 194, 243.
 Windthorst, Dr., 39, 270.
 Windscheidt, Professor, 53.
 Wolff, Albert, 46.
 Women, German, 224, 229, Chapter X.
 Württemberg, Duke of, 93.
 Zaluskowski, Colonel von, 183.
 Zirkel, Professor, 53.





